

ISSN 1467-4785

Volume 3(2)  
September 2002

## Contents

Editorial <i>Craig Roberts (UK)</i>	59
The Internet and Ufology: Which General Search Engine is most effective at finding UFO and related articles? <i>Craig Roberts (UK) and Javier Garcia Frutos (Spain)</i>	60
Petition to UN requesting disclosure of UFO information <i>John Velez (USA) and Hannes la Rue (Germany)</i>	69
FORUM debate article: Supercivilizations and the Extraterrestrial Hypothesis <i>Dan Farcaş (Romania)</i>	70
Not a UFO, but a Bee over Dagestan in 2000 <i>Paul Stonehill (USA)</i>	81
In the matter of Roswell, <i>Project Mogul</i> and Bessie Brazel Schreiber <i>Thomas J. Carey and Donald K. Schmitt (USA)</i>	84

## Price

UK	£4.75
Europe	£5.75

**European Journal of UFO and  
Abduction Studies**

**EJUFOAS is the journal of the  
Totton Researchers of ufology  
Theory and History (TRUTH), and  
is an objective publication,  
primarily for the European  
ufological Community.**

**Editor-in-chief.**

**Craig Roberts B.Sc (Hons)**

*TRUTH, UFO Studies, Department of  
Psychology, Totton College, Water  
Lane, Totton, Southampton, S040 3ZX,  
United Kingdom.*

*E-mail: ejufoas@totton.ac.uk*

**Editorial Board.**

**Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos,**  
*Fundacion Anomalia, Spain.*

**David Clarke Ph.D,** *United Kingdom.*

**Dan Farças Ph.D,** *Association for the  
Study of Unidentified Aerospaceal  
Phenomena (ASFAN), Romania*

**Joaquim Fernandes MA,** *University  
of Fernando Pessoa, Porto, Portugal.*

**Pyotr Kutniuk Ph.D,** *Research  
Institute on Anomalous Phenomena  
(RIAP), The Ukraine.*

**Yuri E. Lozotsev Ph.D,** *Russian State  
Open University of Railway  
Transportation, Russia.*

**Perry Petrakis,** *SOS OVNI, France.*

**Edoardo RussoMA,** *Centro Italiani  
Studi ufologici (CISU), Italy.*

**Massimo Teodorani Ph.D,** *Italy.*

**Paolo Toselli,** *Italy.*

**Maurizio Verga,** *Italy.*

**Associate Editors.**

**Peter Schofield,** *Administrative  
assistant to editor-in-chief.*

**Javier Garcia-Frutos,** *Typesetting,  
translation of abstracts to Spanish.*

**Derek Pavely,** *Typesetting, proof  
reading.*

**Julia Russell Ph.D,** *Proof reading.*

**Helen Shaw B.Eng (Hons),**  
*Typesetting, proof reading.*

**Spencer Farmer,** *Logo, graphics.*

**Associate Reviewers.**

**Matthew Jarvis C.Psychol,**  
*Psychodynamic issues in ufology.*

**John Roberts Ph.D,** *Physics.*

**Helen Shaw B.Eng (Hons),** *Physics.*

**Aims and Scope.**

The European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies (EJUFOAS) is the journal of TRUTH (Totton Researchers of ufology Theory and History), based in Southampton, United Kingdom. The purpose of EJUFOAS is to circulate ideas and contemporary issues related to ufology (UFO's and the alien abduction phenomena). The primary focus is on European ufological issues and debate but non-European paper may be accepted (limited to one per issue). It hopes to foster much needed development in the field of ufology by publishing diverse papers on, Historical Perspectives, Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Research, and European Issues involved in this field. Any appropriate paper will be blind reviewed by at least three members of the editorial board and it is usual that the review process takes 4-6 weeks. Regular issues will include *Forum Debate Articles* usually solicited by the editor-in-chief covering a controversial topic in ufology with the opportunity for peer commentary in subsequent volumes, and *Special Editions* that will focus on one area of this diverse field. Finally, it is hoped that this publication will be ground-breaking and bring the European ufological Community closer by allowing publication of reviewed papers that will generate debate and move the World ufological Community forward through innovative and contemporary discussion.



## Editorial

Welcome to yet another part-volume of the *European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies*. And again, I am very happy with the array of accepted submissions that we have to offer you.

In this edition there is a good paper analyzing the use of internet search engines to locate information about UFOs and related issues. Whilst conducting the research it was an 'eye-opener' to see the lack of high quality literature available online for people to download. We will attempt to replicate the work soon to see if quality has improved. We also offer an intriguing FORUM debate article from Romania. It assesses the Extraterrestrial Hypothesis. If you feel you wish to comment on the paper, please reply in no more than 4 pages of A4 typed – send it to the address on the inside cover of this part-volume.

We also have a few short articles. One focuses on a petition to release UFO information whilst the Paul Stonehill paper examines a sighting over Dagestan in 2000.

In Volume 2(2) we published a paper by Kathryn Gow *et al* that assessed Fantasy Proneness in Abductees (*Fantasy Proneness and Other Psychological Correlates of UFO Experiences*). Soon after publication, Edgar Wunder contacted me, [he is executive director of "Forum Parawissenschaften" (Germany)] to award the paper 'Study of the Month.' The paper was subsequently translated into German and published on their website. Hopefully, this will not be the one and only time that EJUFOAS wins awards. I must thank Kathryn and her colleagues for producing such great research and choosing EJUFOAS to publish it.

Finally, I am excited about the start of a new academic year at my College where this journal is based. For the first time students can have UFO Studies on their timetable. This means that they can study for up to 3 hours per week with me working towards a qualification *and* conducting small scale research projects that I hope will be published, after review, here in EJUFOAS. So, watch out for results of these studies from Volume 4(1) onwards!

# **The Internet and Ufology: Which General Search Engine is most effective at finding UFO and related articles?**

**Craig A. Roberts and Javier Garcia Frutos**

*TRUTH, Department of Psychology, Totton College, Water Lane, Totton,  
Southampton, SO40 3ZX, UK  
[croberts@totton.ac.uk](mailto:croberts@totton.ac.uk)*

## **Abstract**

The aim of this study was to assess a range of search engines and test their ability to retrieve relevant UFO and related links from a variety of disciplines. Over a period of 48 hours, a total of 91 search engines were assessed on 5 simple searches and each was given a relevancy score from 0 to 5. The first 10 links brought up by each search engine was assessed. Therefore, each search engine would generate a score between 0 and 250. Only a total of 40 search engines generated a score above 0. The amount of dead links was also recorded. From these scores, a weighted overall score was calculated that took into account the total relevancy of links and the proportion of dead links generated. Three search engines appeared to rank well above the rest. These were Google, About and Yahoo. However, the highest scoring search engine, Google, still only scored 104 out of 250. This represents either poor quality searching of the web or that there is a paucity of relevant literature on the internet about UFOs and related fields.

## **Introduction**

Since the advent of the internet, people have been using the web more and more as part of their research projects. There have been several studies that have examined the usefulness of general search engines. This usually consists of a researcher typing in different 'search terms' and analysing what each search engine produces.

For example, Notess (2002) used 25 small single queries on 10 different search engines. The Google search engine found more hits than any other search engine under examination. In addition, it recorded the most hits on 23 of the 25 queries used. In a previous study by Notess (2001) reported that Google recorded the most hits using (presumably) the same 25 small single queries as Notess (2002). In this study, Google found the most hits on 19 out of the 25 searches.

Notess (2002) also reports on his previous studies spanning the last six years. As reported above, Google appears to be the current 'winner' but other search engines have performed consistently well including Northern Light, AltaVista, Fast and HotBot.

Sullivan (2002) reported the latest Nielsen/Net Ratings Search Engine Ratings. NetRatings provide worldwide search engine ratings based on a sample of 225,000 web users spanning 26 countries. The sample has real-time meters on their computers to monitor their usage of search engines. Of the search

engines examined, Yahoo, AOL and MSN appear to have the most traffic by some distance. Compared to a previous report (Sullivan 2000), Yahoo, MSN and AOL have held their positions, whereas Lycos, Excite and AltaVista have lost ground.

Computer magazines have also attempted to rate the use of search engines, but they have tended to use either recommendations or a nominal rating system. Search engines that have done well here include MSN, Google, Lycos, AltaVista, Hotbot, Yahoo and Excite.

Finally ZDNet (2001) rate the Intelligence Quotient (IQ) of many search engines. The average IQ is 100 and many engines rate higher than that although the majority are rated lower with some as low as IQ60. Towards the top end we have the following search engines:

<b>IQ score</b>	<b>Search Engines</b>
<b>130</b>	<b>About, Google, Yahoo</b>
125	Twirlix
120	Netscape, Oingo, Open Directory Project, Pandia
115	HotBot
110	Northern Light, Snoopa
105	Aesir, Lycos

Therefore, from the previous research on search engines, a few appear to be consistently ranking high across a series of measures. However, there has never been a search engine test for ufology and related searches. The aim of this study is to examine the relevancy of search engines for UFO and related information.

## **Method**

### **Design**

The idea was to assess each search engine using the following search terms:

- Tectonic strain + UFO
- Roswell + Weather balloon
- Extraterrestrial Hypothesis + UFO
- Alien Abduction + Sleep Paralysis
- Betty + Barney Hill + Alien Abduction

The reason the above five searches were chosen was to cover a variety of angles that ufologists can investigate. The scoring system for each of the links that the search engine reported was as follows:



- 5 = A must link
- 4 = Highly relevant link
- 3 = Very relevant link
- 2 = of Average relevance
- 1 = Partially relevant
- 0 = Not at all relevant

- \* = if the link was dead
- # = no pages found
- X = Not appropriate

Each search engine was rated on its first ten links listed after the keywords had been entered into the search box. The number of links was recorded too. Therefore, each search engine was rated out of 50 per search term giving a grand total out of 250.

### **Sample size**

A total of 91 search engines were used. They were listed at [www.zdnet.com/searchiq/directory/general.html](http://www.zdnet.com/searchiq/directory/general.html) However, only a total of 40 search engines generated links. Of the other search engines, many found no relevant links, were not working or used another search engine to generate its list.

### **Procedure**

All search engines were tested within a 48 hour period. Each search engine's name was placed in an envelope. Each search engine was randomly drawn from the envelope and the search began. After completion, another search engine was chosen and this was repeated until all 91 search engines had been assessed. Only one researcher rated each link (first author).

### **Results**

For each search engine, a number of scores were generated:

- A grand total score out of 250
- A total score out of 50 for each search term
- Percentage of links that were dead
- Weighted Score that takes into account overall scores, ranking per search term and percentage of dead links. The formula for the weighted score was as follows – the average rating per page was calculated. After this the percentage of dead links represented the percentage of the score that was subtracted. This left the weighted score total.

A fictitious example is highlighted below:

Search engine scores a total of 60 points over 50 pages searched (10 for each search term). Therefore, its average rating per page would be  $60/50 = 1.2$ .

The search engine registers 5% dead links, so 5% of the score above must be subtracted giving a weighted score of 1.064.

The following tables show the results for each of the scores listed above:

**Table 1 – The Top 20 search engines by total score out of 250**

Position	Search Engine	Score
1.	google	104
2.	about	97
3.	yahoo	92
4.	hotbot	72
5.	zensearch	69
6.	findwhat	68
7.	goto	67
8.	iWon	67
9.	MSN	65
10.	netflip	63
11.	northern light	62
12.	2look4it	58
13.	quickfindit	57
14.	excite	56
15.	allthesites	51
16.	altavista	51
17.	fast search	48
18.	snap!	48
19.	webtop	47
20.	raging	46

21. simplesearch (45); 22. lycos (42); 23. oingo (41); 24. jassan (38); 25. power search (34); 26. 7search (28); 27. directhit (25); 28. looksmart (14); 29. scrub the web (17); 30. zeal (10).

As can be clearly seen, three search engines rate much higher than any others: google, about and yahoo. However, the maximum score was 250 and google, the top rated search engine in this study only scored 104.

**Table 2 – The Number of Top 10 positions by each search engine.**

<b>Search Engine</b>	<b>Tectonic</b>	<b>Roswell</b>	<b>ETH</b>	<b>Sleep</b>	<b>The Hills</b>
about	<b>=1</b>	<b>1</b>	=9	5	2
allthesites	-	=6	=9	-	-
altavista	-	-	-	=7	-
directhit	-	-	-	=10	=9
excite	-	-	-	9	=3
fastsearch	-	=6	-	-	-
findwhat	-	-	=4	4	<b>1</b>
google	<b>=1</b>	=6	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	-
goto	4	5	-	=10	-
hotbot	=6	2	=9	-	=3
iWon	-	-	7	=10	=3
lycos	5	-	3	-	-
MSN	-	=10	-	6	=3
netflip	-	=6	-	=10	=9
northern light	-	=10	=4	=10	-
quickfindit	=6	-	-	-	=9
raging	10	-	-	-	-
7search	=6	-	-	-	-
simplesearch	-	-	-	=7	=9
snap!	-	4	-	-	8
2look4it	-	3	8	-	-
webtop	9	-	-	-	-
yahoo	3	-	2	2	=9
zensearch	-	-	=4	3	=3

As can be seen, only one search engine featured in the top 10 for each search term; About. Three search engines featured in four of the top 10s: Google, Hotbot and Yahoo.



**Table 3 – The percentage of links that were 'dead'**

Percent 'dead'	Search engines
0%	about, findwhat, quickfindit, thunderseek, twirlix
2%	MSN
3.3%	directhit
4%	hotbot, excite, iWon, yahoo
5%	oingo
6%	simplesearch, netflip, google, goto
6.25%	webhelp
6.4%	zeal
8%	salukisearch,
10%	raging, zensearch, northern light, altavista
12%	snap!
13.6%	looksmart
16%	maxisearch, webtop
18%	allthesites
20%	jassan, 2look4it
22%	fastsearch
24%	powersearch
26%	lycos
32%	scrubtheweb
40%	7search

**Table 4 – the Weighted Score Top 30 search engines**

Rank	Search engine	Score	Rank	Search engine	Score
1	Google	1.955	16	Simplesearch	0.846
2	About	1.940	17	Snap!	0.845
3	Yahoo	1.766	18	Allthesites	0.836
4	Hotbot	1.382	19	Raging	0.828
5	Findwhat	1.360	20	Directhit	0.806
6	iWon	1.286	21	Webtop	0.790
7	MSN	1.274	22	Oingo	0.779
8	Goto	1.260	23	Fast search	0.749
9	Zensearch	1.242	24	Lycos	0.662
10	Netflip	1.184	25	Jassan	0.608
11	Quickfindit	1.140	26	Looksmart	0.550
12	Northern Light	1.116	27	Powersearch	0.517
13	Excite	1.075	28	7search	0.420
14	2look4it	0.928	29	Zeal	0.347
15	Alta Vista	0.918	30	Scrubtheweb	0.231

Maximum score is 5.

As can be seen there are three leaders using this weighted scoring system: Google, About and Yahoo.

**Table 5 – Comparison of ZDnet's IQ ratings and weighted scores in this research for the Top 20 only**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Search Engine</b>	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>IQ (ZDNet)</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Google</b>	<b>1.955</b>	<b>130</b>
2	About	1.940	130
3	Yahoo	1.766	130
4	HotBot	1.382	115
5	FindWhat	1.360	80
6	iWon	1.286	100
7	MSN	1.274	90
8	Goto	1.260	80
9	Zensearch	1.242	unrated
10	Netflip	1.184	80
11	Quickfindit	1.140	90
12	Northern Light	1.116	110
13	Excite	1.075	100
14	2look4it	0.928	65
15	Alta Vista	0.918	90
16	Simplesearch	0.846	80
17	Snap!	0.845	100
18	Allthesites	0.836	unrated
19	Raging	0.828	unrated
20	Direct Hit	0.806	100

The average IQ score is 100

As can be clearly seen, the top three places are filled with the search engines given the highest IQ scores by ZDNet.

### **Discussion**

As can be seen from the presented data, three search engines rated much higher than any others. These were Google, About and Yahoo. However the highest total score (Google) was only 104 out of a possible 250, showing only an average relevancy across the search terms. This indicates that all the search engines are not that good at seeking out a range of UFO information. However, it could be that there is a limited amount of high quality UFO literature published on the internet and the search engines are actually providing a good service.

Even taking the above into consideration there were marked differences between the abilities of the search engines. Some gave out a few good results then gave out a string of irrelevant ones. Also, some of the search engines had up to 40% dead links (see Table 3). The weighted overall scores took into account the above and the same three search engines ranked well above the remainder.

So, how do the findings of this study fit into the previous research that has not been on a specific UFO related search? We appear to corroborate with some of the findings of previous search engine research. Notess (2002) had reported that Google was taking a strong lead in his examination of 10 leading search engines. We have discovered that Google is very good at finding UFO and related material. Over his six years of research, Notess (2002) stated that other search engines had performed consistently well. However, we have found differences compared to his analysis. Other search engines that had performed well in his research included Hotbot (ranked 4<sup>th</sup> here), Northern Light (ranked 12<sup>th</sup> here), Alta Vista (ranked 15<sup>th</sup> here) and Fast (ranked 23<sup>rd</sup> here).

Sullivan (2002) had noted how much a sample of 225,000 people used different search engines. The search engines that came out at the top included Yahoo (ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> here), AOL (not available at the time of this study to rate) and MSN (ranked 7<sup>th</sup> here). Those that had lost ground since his previous analysis (Sullivan 2000) did not perform well in this study. They were Excite (ranked 13<sup>th</sup> here), Alta Vista (ranked 15<sup>th</sup> here) and Lycos (ranked 24<sup>th</sup> here).

In comparison the ZDNet's (2001) IQ scores for each search engine used here, those that filled the top three places here had been given the top IQ scores. However, there are some intriguing differences between the scores given in this study compared to the IQs given by ZDNet. For example, the low IQ scoring FindWhat, Goto, Netflip, 2look4it and Simplesearch have scored rather well in this study. Also, three unrated search engines have reached the top 20 here (Zensearch, Allthesites and Raging). The big 'losers' according to the comparison of the weighted scores to the IQ ratings are Northern Light, Excite, Snap! And Direct Hit. However, at least they ranked in the top 20. High IQ scorers like Twirlix (125), Oingo (120), Open Directory Project (120), Pandia (120), Snoopa (110), Aesir (105) and Lycos (105) failed to register a ranking here (although Oingo reached number 22 and Lycos reached number 24).

Finally, in relation to previous research, it may be useful for other researchers to test the capability of many search engines. We tested 91, very many more than any other research. Some search engines performed very well but are not used in other 'search engine showdowns'. For example, FindWhat (ranked 6<sup>th</sup> here), Zensearch (ranked 9<sup>th</sup> here), Netflip (ranked 10<sup>th</sup> here), Quickfindit (ranked 11<sup>th</sup> here) and 2look4it (ranked 14<sup>th</sup> here) have never featured in previous tests.

As with most research, there are limitations to this study. The rating of the links was only conducted by the lead author so no corroboration exercise took place. Also, there are new search engines out that were not tested here and when this study is replicated more will be added to the 'showdown'.



Further research needs to be conducted using the same scoring system in two different ways:

- Replicate this study using meta-search engines
- Replicate this study on a country-based analysis. Sullivan (2001) reports on the percentage 'reach' of many search engines in Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK. It would be interesting to see how the country-based search engines compare with one another. Therefore, searching would become more efficient for ufologists.

In conclusion, it would appear that there are currently three search engines that are very useful to ufologists: Google, About and Yahoo. However, the overall scores were low possibly indicating that the internet does not have many high quality articles that are of use to researching ufologists.

## References

Notess, G. (2001) Search Engine Statistics: Relative Size Showdown. <http://www.searchengineshowdown.com/stats/size.shtml> (accessed 26/11/01) - 4 pages.

Notess, G. (2002) Search Engine Statistics: Relative Size Showdown. <http://www.searchengineshowdown.com/stats/size.shtml> (accessed 25/03/02) - 4 pages.

Sullivan, D. (2000) Nielsen/NetRatings Search Engine Ratings. <http://searchenginewatch.com/reports/netratings.html> (accessed 11/02/01) - 4 pages.

Sullivan (2001) Jupiter MMXI European Search Engine Ratings. <http://searchenginewatch.com/reports/mmxi-europe.html> (accessed 25/03/02) - 8 pages.

Sullivan, D. (2002) Nielsen/NetRatings Search Engine Ratings. <http://searchenginewatch.com/reports/netratings.html> (accessed 25/03/02) - 5 pages.

ZDNet (2001) Search IQ. <http://www.zdnet.com/searchiq/directory/general.html> (accessed 24/02/01) - 9 pages.

## **Petition to UN requesting disclosure of UFO information**

John Velez<sup>1</sup> and Hannes la Rue<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Petition Coordinator USA, [john@virtuallystrange.net](mailto:john@virtuallystrange.net), [www.virtuallystrange.net](http://www.virtuallystrange.net)*

<sup>2</sup> *MUFON-CES Germany, [hannes.la.rue@mufon-ces.org](mailto:hannes.la.rue@mufon-ces.org), [www.mufon-ces.org](http://www.mufon-ces.org)*

The Society for the Scientific Investigation of Anomalous Atmospheric and Radar Phenomena (MUFON-CES) supports the international, multilingual petition requesting a United Nations investigation and disclosure of UFO information by member nations. It is formally addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations and urges UN member nations to "to take certain elementary actions in regard to their official studies of and activities related to the phenomenon known as Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOs)." It is an established fact that such documents exist, because various states have already disclosed UFO documents (Ballester Olmos, Vicente-Juan (1999): UFO Declassification: The Spanish Model). The petition will be delivered to the Office of The Secretary General in March of 2003.

We want to ask you to help the petition become a success. You can read the petition text here:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/petition/english.html>

You can get engaged as follows: Sign the petition yourself!  
<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/petition/VSp3.php>

Place the banner on your web site!

[http://www.mufon-ces.org/img/petition\\_en.jpg](http://www.mufon-ces.org/img/petition_en.jpg)

If you want to get informed on the UFO subject you can start here:

<http://www.fufor.com/intro.htm>

For a scientific approach to UFOs we recommend Dr. Haisch's site:

<http://www.ufoskeptic.org/>

The URL of this call is:

<http://www.mufon-ces.org/text/english/news/2002-05-18-petition.htm>

Please support the petition with your signature.

# FORUM debate article: Supercivilizations and the Extraterrestrial Hypothesis

Dan D. Farcaş PhD

*Association for the Study of Unidentified Aerospace Phenomena (ASFAN),  
Romania*

*This essay exposes a synthesis of the some current ideas, as well as personal opinions, about the extraterrestrial hypothesis (ETH): the possibility of existence of other civilizations in our Universe, some of them very old, the possibilities of contact with them, as well as the consequences for the study of the UFO phenomenon and for all of us.*

## **How many civilizations are in the Universe?**

Now it is accepted that major part of the stars have planets. The spectroscopy assures us that water and the basic components of carbonic life, including aminoacids, are everywhere in Cosmos. More and more specialists admit that the germs of life are travelling throughout the space, "infecting" immediately all appropriate places. If the favorable conditions last several billion years, life can reach the abundance and complexity we see on our Earth. In some cases such a complex life system can give rise to a "technological civilization", that means to intelligent beings capable to build spaceships to conquer other inhabitable planets.

How many such "technological civilizations" could be in this moment in the Universe, excepting ourselves? Frank Drake proposed in 1961 a well-known formula to estimate this number. Several researchers made, on this base, their own calculations, for our Galaxy - the *Milky Way*. The results were varying from tens of thousands to zero.

I did again this calculation, respecting more the spirit than the form of Drake equation. Some estimates give 400 billion stars in our Galaxy. Probable around 1.5 billion of them are third generation stars, with sufficiently long life span (minimum 5 billion years), with solid rocky planets, containing heavy elements, with stable orbits. Probable 20 millions of these planets are in the "ecosphere", that is they have a temperature maintaining liquid water, sufficiently high gravity to retain the water for billions of years, near circular orbit, reasonable day-night and summer-winter alternation etc. Practically on all of them, life will appear, but it will reach the abundance we see on Earth on about one million planets. One percent of such biospheres will give birth eventually, after billions of years of evolution, to a "technological civilization". I hope I am not too optimistic supposing that 9 of 10 such civilizations will destroy themselves or will degenerate, but 1 of 10 will survive for a very long time, maybe millions of years, metamorphosing itself eventually in something we can name a **supercivilization**. Following our calculation, the Milky Way can give birth to around 1000 such supercivilizations. Several hundreds



appeared in the past and are existing now; the rest will appear in future. This is a good average between the figures proposed in literature.

But, if somebody considers that we were too optimistic, and the intelligent beings are much more scarce, we should add that our Milky Way is only one of about *100 billion* more or less similar galaxies of the Universe accessible to our instruments. And we have strong reasons to believe that there are other universes too, maybe "parallel" ones, maybe from other states of substance etc. Therefore *it is almost absolutely sure that in the Universe there are now many supercivilizations.*

### **What can be a supercivilization?**

Unfortunately, we know only one technological civilization – our own - and no supercivilization. Yet, the only more or less rational way to answer the question "what can be a supercivilization?" is to extrapolate our evolution in future, supposing we will avoid self-destruction.

If the pioneers will not disappear, in several decades the planet Mars will be explored, as well as some other bodies in our Solar System. Afterwards we will start to think about other solar systems. There are one thousand stars in the neighborhood of 54 light years. 46 of them seem to have solar systems similar to ours.

In the last fifty years the engineers imagined a lot of starships to travel towards them. We can mention the thermonuclear ships ORION and DAEDALUS, the ionic ship YANTAR, the laser ships STARLIGHT or SUPERSTARLIGHT and so on. Not the technology is missing but the money and the motivation. These very "classical" ships can cover the distance of 4 light-years until the nearest star – Proxima Centauri – in fifty years. Arriving there, the travelers could build colonies and, maybe in other fifty years, three other starships. These starships, and the next generations of pioneers, would repeat the performance in another century and so on, as in a nuclear reaction. In this manner, the human race could conquer the Milky Way in one or two million years. Of course, supposing the science and technology will stop at the level of XXI century, which is extremely unlikely. Otherwise the time will be considerably shorter. Some other authors find greater or smaller values. Freeman Dyson or Joseph Shklovskii spoke about 10 million years; Stanislaw Lem was convinced that this period will be only of several hundreds of thousands years.

But I am strongly convinced that in the next centuries (or sooner) we will discover new principles of physics to avoid the limitation imposed by the speed of light. Theories as the superstrings, the sub-quantum world, the energy of vacuum and many other new approaches, as well as some recent experiments assure us that, in several centuries, all actual preconceptions concerning the nature of substance, space, time, dimensions etc. will be changed. Thus the inter-stellar travels will be much simpler and much shorter than we can imagine today.

The human race will change too. Research projects are in progress concerning regeneration, extension of life expectancy, genetic engineering, bio-robots, cyborgs, etc. Almost all bigger artificial objects will become "intelligent" in the near future, with integrated microchips, and will be interconnected, through the Internet, with all computers and databases in the

world. The wireless command of all those appliances and computers will be made by microprocessors implanted in head, connected directly to the human brain. In less than one hundred years it will be sufficient to think about a topic and in the next moment all the requested information will be in the mind of the person interested. We will see through eyes situated thousands of kilometers away, we will act with robot arms at the same distance, or we will meet each other in the virtual reality, all only through this kind of implant, without the complicated appliances used today in tele-presence. Moreover, we will speak to each other "mind-to-mind", through the digital network, without sounds, and at any distance.

In the XXX century shall we still use words to communicate? Shall we still be bound to our physical body? We can continue with these questions. But all the above is only for the next several centuries. What could bring us the progress in *one million* years is far beyond our imagination. Therefore it seems almost sure that *a supercivilization will have no problems to perform interstellar travels in a reasonable time*, and that *we could not make the distinction between the technology of such supercivilization and magic*.

### **The time gap**

If our estimates were correct, the average distance between the supercivilizations in our Galaxy is of several thousands light years. But, paradoxically, not these distances give the most important divide, but those in time.

As we accept now, the age of the observable Universe is at least 15 billion years, starting with the "Big Bang". We were lucky, as it was a Universe favorable for life (the *Anthropic Principle*). At the beginning there were only hydrogen and helium. Stars of first and second generation were formed and burst after some time, creating heavy elements to form third generation stars as the Sun, with some rocky planets as our Earth. More than 4 billion years ago the life began to develop on it. Two billion years ago the first eukaryote cell appeared, after another billion, the first tiny worm, and, in the last billion, the descendants of this worm realized a technological civilization.

In this marathon of more than 15 billion years, of the life and intelligence throughout the Universe, the chances were different in different places. This difference could be of hundreds of millions years or more. As an example, at 37 light years from us there are two stars: *Zeta1* and *Zeta2 Reticuli*, both of them of the same type as the Sun, but older than it with one billion years. By coincidence or not, these stars are often mentioned in the UFO abduction stories as the origin of abductors.

If we accept, for the sake of simplicity, that the several hundred supercivilizations supposed to be in the Milky Way were born, in a uniform way, along one billion years, it results that supercivilizations appear each 2-3 million years. This is the "normal" gap between two neighboring civilizations in time, despite the fact that, in all SF encounters, the technological distance between two civilizations is only of several hundreds or thousands of years. In 2-3 million years, a technological civilization should be *transformed in something else*, maybe in *spiritual beings*, or *virtual beings*, maybe in something we cannot even imagine. And we have to think also about the



oldest supercivilization, which could have one billion years ahead of us. I repeat - our ancestor, one billion years ago, was a small worm. In the next billion the evolution can be faster. What should be now *they*, the masters of supercivilizations, what shape they have, after another billion? We can only hypothesize that they became a *Higher Intelligence*.

*In this huge time gap, of hundreds of millions of years, between the early supercivilizations and us we can find the key to answer to the most of the problems linked with our cosmic destiny.*

### **Where are they?**

Following our estimates, our civilization could have conquered the Galaxy in a maximum two million years. Almost sure, all supercivilizations did somehow the same before us, millions of years ago. Therefore they should know, for long time, a lot about us and *they should be here, now*. But, at least officially, they are not. The tradition says that Enrico Fermi put first, in the early forties, the rhetorical question: "They should be here; where are they?" Were we wrong? Are we, in spite of our calculations, alone in the Universe?

For most of the people it seems normal that if some (friendly) space travelers come to us, they should land at the White House Loan (why not in Place de la Concorde, or in front of the Buckingham Palace, or in the Red Place or Tien An Men Place etc?). The visitors should ask to see the Big Chief of the Earth, and to offer us some new technologies in exchange for some goods or rights here (e.g. raw materials or genetic experiments on humans), and so on. For most of the people it seems normal that a cosmic civilization will send us, by radio, some signals about their existence, waiting for an answer. For many others, a space invasion, as in the "*Independence Day*" movie, is perfectly plausible (as well as the final victory of USA). *All these scenarios about ET contact are false, being mined by serious preconceptions.*

### **A list of several ET preconceptions**

We can start with the **preconception of equal rights**. A difference of millions of years, or even hundreds of millions, is so huge as between us and a monkey or a lizard. If they are here (as it is highly probable), they can examine us, monitor our evolution, even contact us in some form, but they will never put them at the same level with us.

The second could be the **preconception of conversation**. Even we interact sometimes with a lizard; this will never be a conversation. G. Cocconi and P. Morrison, argued in 1959, that if the difference between two civilizations is of millions of years, the probability they exchange ideas is zero.

Another preconception is the **temporal chauvinism** (or *temporal provincialism* upon J. Allen Hynek). It states that, in opposition with the previous centuries, the last one or the last two hundred years brought us *finally* to the light of truth and science. In this light, now we can decide what can be real and what will never be possible. If one hundred years ago or so we discovered the radio, some believe it will last the best mean of communications forever. If one hundred years ago Einstein postulated that the speed of light is a limit, no other physical law will be discovered until the



end of times to avoid this limit, etc. As a peculiar example, we have the **SETI preconception**. According to it, even if the radio signals need thousands of years from one inhabited world to other, some civilizations will consider that these radio signals are the most appropriate mean for cosmic contacts; and we should search for them.

For some people (I suspect many of them are linked with the military-industrial complex) it should be normal if a cosmic civilization arrives at the Earth, it will attempt to conquer us by force. They should be "invaders", as in so many SF novels and movies. This can be named the **preconception of the invasion**. If we agree with the reasoning in the first part of this article, we should accept that, for almost sure, no invasion will take place in future. That is because the supercivilizations knew about us millions of years ago, therefore they could invade us in those times, and, in a certain sense, *we are already invaded* by them, for millions of years.

There are some well-known footprints in stone, as in *Berea* (Kentucky) or *Antelope Springs* (Utah) as old as 500-600 million years. Inside rocks formed thousands or millions of years ago, very old and unexplainable technical objects were found too, as those of *Schöndorf* (Austria), *Coso Mountains* (California), *Narada* river (East Ural, Russia), etc., even in Romania near *Aiud*, in the bed of the river Mures. Maybe they are signs that somebody is visiting us for a very long time.

Of the same kind is the **preconception of intervention**. The UFO sects hope that the ET will help us (or at least the "chosen") to overcome some future catastrophes. Although it is not a perfect comparison, we can remember that centuries ago, when people arrived to a new place (e.g. a wild valley, an uninhabited island) they settled, building houses, destroying the forest to make agriculture, bringing cows, pigs, hens, killing tigers, bears, wolves etc. In the name of biodiversity, now we understand that this attitude cannot continue, and in the last decades we witness a strong ecological movement. Now the norm is that if we discover a valuable piece of land, which escaped from the human intervention, a new island or a new valley in the rain forest, we shall declare it a reservation, permitting only a very limited intervention, for scientific reasons. Following these regulations of *non-intervention*, a researcher cannot help today even a baby turtle to overcome an obstacle toward the sea. This attitude seems to be strengthening in future. A supercivilization observing the Earth and the human technological civilization should act in a similar manner, avoiding to interfere in our evolution, but taking samples, making some experiments, having very limited contacts (not at all as equals) with only some individuals, selected upon their and not our criteria. With the premises above, we can accept that the Earth could be seen as a cosmic reservation monitored by some supercivilizations (it is close to the so-called *zoo hypothesis*). There are, in my opinion, some other stronger reasons for non-intervention too, which transcend the zoo hypothesis. I will refer to them later in this paper.

Therefore *no settlement, no destruction, on one hand, and no official contact, conversation or substantial help, on the other hand, are to be expected from the advanced cosmic civilizations, even if they are here now.*

### **The primitive ET hypothesis and some questions about UFOs**

Many persons promote and believe in a *primitive extraterrestrial hypothesis* (ETH). In opposition with the ETH exposed early in this article, the primitive ETH states: that everything with ET is "nuts and bolts" material, that the limit imposed by the speed of light will never be transcended (or not too much) by any civilization, that all travel in Cosmos will be made from one planet to another, by more or less STARLIGHT type spaceships, and, very important, that the difference in evolution between two encountering civilizations is equivalent at most with several hundreds or thousands of years.

Obviously, with this meaning of the concept "extraterrestrial", many significant researchers are reluctant to accept the extraterrestrial origin of UFOs. The best example is probably Jacques Vallée. He expressed four main objections in this respect.

The first objection was that there are *too many UFO landings* to be ships of some space explorers. A Romanian skeptic asked even if "did the Earth became kind of Cosmic Mecca?" I believe, for a supercivilization the cosmic distances are more affordable than to us, thanks to their additional millions of years of scientific and technological progress. But if we accept the supercivilizations monitor us for a long time, they can have some *cosmic bases* nearby, the UFOs being suitable mainly for short distances. On the other hand, the apparition of a new technological civilization, candidate for a future supercivilization, is a rare event in a Galaxy, occurring once in several hundreds of thousands or even in several millions of years. We are alone, in our entire Galaxy, for a long time, in this "new-born" phase. It is nothing unusual that such an event is of a great interest for the older civilisations.

The second objection was that the reported behavior of UFOs is too strange (non-inertial movements, weightlessness, curved or cut beams of light, stopping the time, beings passing through the walls etc.). But for the inhabitants of the rain forest, the wireless Internet could be magic too. They did sometimes even worship our technical achievements. And do not forget - the distance in evolution between a possible supercivilization and us is many thousands time greater than between the rain forest people and us.

To say "it is impossible" because "it contradicts the laws of the nature" is a proof of a great arrogance or ignorance. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau* observed that "to say that something contravene the laws of the nature you should know the laws of nature. Who can say that he knows all of them?" In the same manner, several centuries before, a scholar was denying the possibility of miracles, because they contradict the laws of nature. Saint *Toma D'Aquino* answered him "*You believe you know all the laws of the nature?*"

*Why now, at the beginning of XXI century some still behave as if they know all of them?*

### **Genetic experiments**

The third objection of Jacques Vallée was that the reported appearance of EBE ("extraterrestrial biological entities") associated with the UFO encounters are too close to the shape of humans. There are even reports about alleged interbreeding, which would be possible only if humans and extraterrestrials are of the same species. This is a serious objection indeed. On one hand, the



carbonic life, based on the DNA, seems to be the base for most (if not all) life forms in the Universe, not because it is the only possible, but because it was the most efficient in the marathon that begun with the *Big Bang*. On the other hand it is highly improbable that the creators of two independent civilizations, born on two different planets, far away in space and time, will be genetically close (in terms of DNA).

But - who can say what interbreeding technologies could be discovered in future by the genetic engineering, after not hundreds but millions of years? We can only speculate, for example, that an elusive supercivilization could try to realize, using genetic materials from the Earth, new human races, with greater brain, with higher intelligence, adapted for some special tasks, etc. Many "races" described by the alleged abductees (the grays, the tall blonds etc.) can be such artificial human races or even biorobots derived from the human species. They can be "produced" for example in reservations or bases somewhere outside the Earth. In the same manner we make new varieties of wheat from the traditional ones. Sometimes, the perfect variety of wheat became sterile or exposed to new diseases. At that moment the agronomists will try to find some appropriate genes in the pool represented by the primitive species of wheat, to improve the "perfect" variety. What if humans on Earth are the "wild pool" of genes, suitable to improve some artificial races? In this case it will be no problem of compatibility between the visitors and us. Hypotheses like this could explain much of the reported UFO abduction and hybridization stories.

Some people even suppose there was an external intervention in the apparition of the mankind as well as subsequent interventions to improve it. For what purpose? To create, finally, the "superman" dreamed by Nietzsche? For more creativity or an increased intelligence? Some analyses estimate that the volume of the brain of an EBE is at least double in comparison with that of humans. What is interesting is that human babies with such a big brain cannot be born in the natural way, because of the anatomical limitations of pelvis. The abortion after three months and the subsequent development of the embryos in incubators, as in UFO abduction stories, could be a solution...

The old writings are full of genetic experiments to improve the human species. In the Bible we have the creation of Eve from Adam's rib (cloning?), afterwards undesirable hybrids were made by the fallen angels, Noah was an ideal model, all other human specimen being destroyed etc. There are such examples in the writings of many other religions and in popular traditions. The Greek heroes as Achilles, Perseus, Hercules etc. were supposed to be half-human half-divine hybrids. Alexander the Great, Julius Cesar and many others pretended to have a similar origin. In addition we have the stories about *incubus* and *succubus* in the roman antiquity, or about fairies in the Middle Ages, and other similar creatures almost everywhere. In the present days we have all the UFO abduction and hybridization stuff, starting with the case of Antonio Villas Boas. With almost no exception all the actors performing such hybridization were coming from the sky. It seems to be more than a coincidence.

*All genetic experiment stories: from the Bible, from other religious or folkloric traditions and from UFO abduction reports, are compatible with the*



*monitoring of Earth and mankind by a Higher Intelligence, belonging to supercivilizations.*

### **Why they do not offer us their technologies?**

A fourth objection of Jacques Vallée was that the scientific and technological level shown by UFO visitors to the abductees is too close to ours. This contradicts a bit its own second objection. But, if we accept it, that could have two explanations: on one hand, the reports contain only what the witness understood, and a person understands more or less what he can explain in terms of our current scientific and technological concepts. On the other hand, it could be an "embargo" imposed by the visitors themselves, due to their non-intervention policy, an interdiction to show us too much.

In many reports the visitors stated that they fear the human *aggressiveness* and *xenophobia*. All the technology in the hands of humans becomes weapons. Advanced technologies given to the humans would lead to a great danger, both for us and for other civilizations. Therefore the whole mankind should come to a moral maturity before any exchange of sophisticated technologies.

Another argument often used is that showing us too much, even giving us a final proof of their existence (as the requested landing on the White House Lawn) will lead to a "*cultural shock*", virtually destroying all our social, religious, economical, political, cultural etc. structures. I suppose it is still *more than that*. The supercivilizations should have a complete exchange of ideas, technologies etc. among them. Eventually this complete exchange leads to a deadlock. A *new, fresh, viewpoint* can be offered only by an outsider, with two conditions: to have sufficient maturity as civilization (to have something to say to the supercivilizations and to resist their "cultural shock") and to be not influenced in the past, in any way, by the older civilizations.

Therefore, as a hypothesis, we can state that *the Cosmic Intelligence is elusive also because it is waiting something very important, not only for us but for itself too. It waits (and maybe harvests even now) our original ideas, viewpoints, creation, produced as a result of millions of years of our independent evolution, and all this could be destroyed by a premature contact.*

### **The Database Earth**

Trying to extrapolate our own future, to understand better what a supercivilization could be, we do not neglect of course the progresses of information and communication technology. Upon some estimates, all verbal information used by a person in his life is about 30-100GB. If we add all the images, this will sum up to around 1 million GB. An average computer memory, around the year 2040, will attain this capacity. Until the end of the century, probably all information, all thoughts, all small gestures, concerning all human beings on Earth could be stored in the memory of one computer. It is not yet clear through what kind of channels the information will be collected, the best solution could be a chip implanted directly in connection with the brain (there are many experiments in this direction); but it is a technical detail... A very important reduction in size will be achieved retaining

only the "essential" ideas, gestures etc., because many of them are repeated, or are common for most people.

From the data about him, a person could be restored in a virtual reality. In the "cyberspace" we shall construct alternate worlds; there we shall meet living or deceased people, not only with their appearance, but also with their ideas and gestures. They will answer even new questions, in the manner they would answer in their life. Gradually it will be more and more hard to distinguish the material reality from the virtual one, as it is suggested in some recent SF movies.

If a supercivilization is interested to "harvest" the information produced by humans, it will install such a "memory" somewhere nearby, and will install also appropriate appliances to collect data (maybe implants), at least from some interesting persons. The use of such a "memory" will be somehow similar with our virtual reality. In this "memory" could be included images from the past as well as scenarios of the future. Of course, a supercivilization can do much more in this respect. For example, they could maybe give to the virtual copies of a person some autonomy, the consciousness of living further, after their death, even some initiative or free will.

What kind of "hardware" this memory could be based on is difficult to say, but it should not be material as a present-day computer. Many abductees or contactees spoke about ethereal light balls as "deposits of knowledge and intelligence", memorizing "everything in the Universe". Such a "memory" installed by a Higher Intelligence is frequently recalled, starting with the "Book of Life" in the biblical writings or the "Akashic Records" of Tibet and India, and up to the more prosaic "Galactic Encyclopedia" of Carl Sagan.

If such a memory exists (and it is highly probable), it can explain many paradoxical reports. This memory could be the source for channeling (as for healers like Edgar Cayce, Arigó, etc.), for speaking in languages never learned, etc. Such a memory can account for "walk-ins", for "reincarnation", for stories of past lives, ghosts, etc., as all of these phenomena could be insights of the medium to the knowledge about deceased people. It can even explain how Hamlet could obtain information from his murdered father.

In such a virtual reality the time is different. We can travel in the past, even interfering in some events, but only in the virtual reality, without actually changing this past. We can also travel in future, encountering catastrophes, apocalyptic events, without the necessity to accept an unchangeable future (contradicting our free will), because this future is only a scenario with a certain probability to be realized, not a fate.

*Therefore, many of UFO encounters, as well as many other mystical or unexplainable encounters throughout the world, could be, at least in part, such virtual contacts, staged by the masters of a supermemory installed by a Higher Intelligence belonging to supercivilizations.*

### **Spiritual worlds?**

It is highly improbable the world of supercivilizations is the same as ours. In millions of years of evolution the Cosmic Intelligence should discover not only traveling skills avoiding the limit of the speed of light, but also some other forms of the substance (the two seems to be in connection). As all the material



particles are accompanied by a wave and can be regarded in both manners, maybe there is also a structured spiritual double of the material Universe as well as of the living creatures in it. The "supermemory" could be itself something "spiritual". We can speculate even further, supposing for example that the spiritual world was before, or that the material world is only a kind of a great virtual reality or so, even these hypotheses seem unlikely.

Also, the whole Universe (or rather the "Multiverse") could be much older and much more complex than the part we can observe with our instruments. What was before the "Big Bang"? What is beyond the limits of our close Universe (maybe in another dimension or another state of reality, maybe in a spiritual state of the substance)? If there is another Universe, similar to ours, that means we can have an infinity of them. Accepting that our Universe was born by a "Big Bang", maybe we should accept also an ending "Big Crunch" after let us say 100 billions of years. Is this time sufficient for the intelligence born inside this Universe to find an escape? To move to another Universe? If so, *we should accept the existence of a Higher Intelligence much older than our Universe. It could be, around us, as well a **hierarchy of supercivilizations and of intelligence**, potentially with no end.*

### **Supercivilizations and Divinity**

Therefore, even if we were too optimistic, the probability is 0.99999... that *a supercivilization is now here on Earth*, monitoring us. In the history, in old writings, as well as in our days, there are many reports about unexplained facts and happenings (including the UFO encounters), that seem to prove its presence. They are in general ignored or refuted by the mainstream science and seldom accepted as miracles by the Church. However, now, when we have huge databases on them, we discover that these reports are so many and so self-consistent that we could accept them as a second argument for the presence of the supercivilizations on Earth.

The science and technology as well as the objectives of such supercivilizations are far beyond our understanding. The same is true for the endless hierarchies of supercivilizations. As it was observed, it is not possible for humans to distinguish between the acts of a civilization, millions of years ahead of us, and magic. We can add – *in the limits of rationality, the human mind cannot distinguish between the activity of such supercivilizations and what we know as sacred, holy, divine.*

As an example, the statement that divinity has unlimited powers, leads to a paradox: can Divinity erect a wall so resistant that even he cannot destroy it? If yes, his power is limited by that wall, if not, there are limits in what he can do. The rational answer is to accept, instead of "unlimited power"; attributes like "more powerful than anything that we can imagine". Or we can say that this attribute of divine is beyond our understanding. In both cases we have a good example that we cannot distinguish between a supercivilization in the top of the hierarchy (or its main leadership) and divinity. The same can be repeated for all attributes of the divine. For example, instead of "without beginning", we can say "older than any other intelligence in the larger Universe" and so on.



If we define a concept, we should distinguish it from other concepts. If we have no means to distinguish two concepts, we should recognize that the two concepts are identical (at least for us) and we have only *two names for the same concept*. In our case, we can not distinguish the "Higher Intelligence of a supercivilization in the top of the hierarchy" from "Divinity". Therefore for us *"Higher Intelligence of supercivilizations" is just another name for Divine*.

#### **Closing remark**

Of course, the reader understood that all the above is not a *proof* that the extraterrestrial hypothesis is the explanation for everything strange, particularly for UFOs. It is, beyond all exotic conjectures, reasoning that the extraterrestrial hypothesis (of course not the primitive one) cannot be discarded with the arguments we have at this moment. More than that – this hypothesis seems to be highly probable. But, of course, there is room for other hypotheses too, and we have still to wait for the certain, doubtless answers.

## **Not a UFO, but a Bee over Dagestan in 2000**

**Paul Stonehill**

*Russian Ufology Research Center  
P.O. Box 571951, Tarzana, CA 91357-1951, USA*

According to Russian journalist Vyacheslav Fyodorov (<http://www.warlib.ru/>), the UFO sighted over Dagestan on November 14, 2000 was actually an advanced Russian weapon, an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). The sighting was widely reported throughout the world after the initial story carried by Interfax Agency; Philip Mantle and my new book about Russian ufology contains a detailed account of this and other fascinating sightings and UFO reports from the Caspian Sea. Dagestan is one of the republics of the former USSR; a part of the Russian Federation, it is located between Caspian Sea on the East and Caucasus mountains on the West; it borders Chechnya.

Combining Mr. Fyodorov's information and some thorough independent research, I have found out the following.

In March of the year 2000, the Russian Defense Ministry had approved an unmanned reconnaissance system Stroy-P (unmanned reconnaissance complex or PRC). The system was created in the Yakovlev Experimental Design Bureau, a major Russian military aircraft manufacturer, (OKB imeni Yakovleva) named for A. S. Yakovlev, a famous Soviet aircraft designer. The Yak Aircraft Corporation is now a privatized Russian aviation corporation. Pchela (a drone component of the complex) was built, as far as is known, at the Kishtim Radio Plant, with the help of the Smolensk Aviation Plant (while the Smolensk Aviation Plant joined with the Yakovlev Design Bureau in March, 1992 to form the Yak Aviation Company, the two entities seem to be operating separately); the official maker of the Pchela is Kulon Scientific Research Institute (R&D Institute of Aircraft Technology). This system, or complex, includes a launcher on caterpillar-fitted platform, two vehicles and ten (initially, five) Pchela-1T 061 aircraft. The Stroy-P complex was accepted for service with the Russian Army in 1997.

A Pchela (remotely piloted reconnaissance drone that provides television surveillance of ground targets) weighs 130 kilograms (loaded), has an operational range of 110 to 150 kilometers, can fly at altitudes ranging from 100 meters to 3 kilometers, and cruises at speeds from 11- to 150 kilometers an hour. Combat-recorded range: 55 kilometers. Its flight endurance is 2 hours (it needs 20 liters of gasoline for this). Its power plant is piston plus two solid

rockets takeoff boosters (power at 32hp). Onboard of the Russian drone are a video camera, a still camera, a mapping camera, and a secure radio. It uses a parachute for landing. Pchela is probably equal in capability to many Western UAV in the same class. However, it is a slower, tactical unmanned aerial vehicle than, for example, the Russian the 800-kilometer-per-hour Reis UAV.

The chronology is as follows: in 1982, the Soviet military gave instructions to the A.S. Yakovlev Design Bureau to develop a small, remotely piloted aerial vehicle (distantionno-pilotiruemyi letatel'niy apparat, or DPLA). The person in charge of the project was a talented designer, Yuri Yankevich . Years later, a DPLA-605 Pchela was developed. This was first Soviet UAV capable of monitoring ground targets with an on-board television camera that had a real-time downlink. Later, Pchela (Russian word for a honey bee), the unmanned tactical reconnaissance drone (bespilotnyi samolet, in Russian), was modified to Pchela-1T (TV observer), Pchela-1IK (new version), and according to [www.aviation.ru/Yak/](http://www.aviation.ru/Yak/), to Expert , a 5-th generation unmanned tactical reconnaissance drone to replace Pchela from the Stroy-P system.

Back in the summer of 2000 the Russians were conducting test flights of their Pchela-1T light unmanned reconnaissance aircraft, according to Mr. Fyodor. Apparently, Russian media carried stories about the "airplane-robot" and its onboard TV camera. The Pchela drones tested in November of 2000 are also equipped to fly in the nighttime and have infrared vision capability. The timing of the UFO sighting over Dagestan and the tests of the Pchela drones coincide.

Similar "UFO" flew into the Soviet Union back in 1969, and turned out to be an unmanned American espionage aircraft. The Soviets were sufficiently impressed, and their government ordered that a similar aircraft be developed per Soviet standards and equipment. However, the Soviets were designing their own unmanned spy planes back in the late 1950s and 1960s. We can be certain that some UFO sightings through the years of the Cold War were nothing but tests of such aircraft observed by innocent bystanders.

Meanwhile, the Pchela was incorporated, as a weapon, by Russian armed forces in 1997. There is a special unit dedicated to the use of unmanned aviation systems in the town of Akhtyubinsk, in the Astrakhan province of southern Russia (a Russian state aviation research center is located there as well). Russian Bees are sold to foreign buyers, too, and have been featured at the Russian pavilions at the international aviation exhibitions. The Russians have used the Pchela in Chechnya, but Mr. Fyodorov doubts that the Russian military has utilized the weapon's potential fully. However, Russian Military Parade magazine (1999) claims something different. Their information came from a source in the Russian Defense Ministry. This source claimed that decision to use PRCs in Chechnya to provide continuous aerial reconnaissance and target designation



data for the Federal troops has been taken after analyzing the results of combat operations in Dagestan. The fact is, when suppressing the fire positions of the rebels, the Russian troops were in lack of reconnaissance information, transmitted in the real time mode. Also, in 1995, the Stroy-P complex was already used in Chechnya (a Pchela weighed 138 kilograms at the time). According to [www.rg.ru/english/Archiv/2000/0114/1.htm](http://www.rg.ru/english/Archiv/2000/0114/1.htm), the unmanned air reconnaissance military unit was situated on the mountain Goiten-Kort near Khankala. The "plane-robot" proved its unique abilities having received a lot of valuable information that saved hundreds of lives. But the Russian Defense Ministry lacked funds to procure the upgraded weapons (according to the information from 1999; obviously, in the year 2000 the funds to procure upgraded Stroy-P complexes were found). According to the same source, the Pchela-1 RPC made 10 flights in Chechnya, with the total flight time accumulated of 7 hours 25 minutes. Why would the Pchela be operated over Dagestan? -To provide the round-the-clock control over 200 kilometers of the Chechnya border, and to block the attempts of rebels to penetrate the adjacent territories, according to the Military Parade's source. In 2000, the same magazine had an interesting article written by Nikolai Novichkov , Editing Director of the ITAR-TASS Department of Scientific and Technical Information. The author claimed that due to financial restraints, the Defense Ministry has not yet purchased a single new Stroy-II complex and currently has only three earlier produced sets (the article was published in early 2000), one of which was tested in Chechnya. Russia's Defense Ministry is expected to spur adoption for service of the Pchela-1T RPV (or RPC-P.S.) with night vision equipment. The Pchela-1T RPVs employed in Chechnya (at the time Mr. Novichkov's article was published) were equipped with only day surveillance TV cameras. The Pchela version, fitted out with infrared night-vision devices, was developed a long time ago, but its tests still had not been completed in early 2000 due to lack of funds. In November of 2000 the tests were performed, as the sightings reported confirm. Another confirmation of the tests can be found here:  
[http://www.vor.ru/science/madeinrus15\\_eng.html](http://www.vor.ru/science/madeinrus15_eng.html)

The "UFO" sighted over Dagestan, it appears, was one of Russian Army's tactical reconnaissance assets.

By the way, in 1989 a Nikolai Novichkov was one of the editors of the English-Russian Dictionary of Antimissile & Anti-satellite Defense (Moscow Military Publishing House). The dictionary had unidentified flying object as an entry (page 353). I believe he is the author of the article in Military Parade. This is a footnote in the turbulent history of UFOs over the USSR.

**In the matter of  
Roswell, *Project Mogul* and Bessie Brazel Schreiber**

**Thomas J. Carey<sup>1</sup> & Donald R. Schmitt<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>e-mail: [TCarey1947@aol.com](mailto:TCarey1947@aol.com)

<sup>2</sup>e-mail: [SchmittDon47@aol.com](mailto:SchmittDon47@aol.com)

Any lawyer who has ever gone to court to try a case hopes to have, in addition to physical and documentary evidence to present to a judge and jury, a long line of corroborating witnesses [e.g., eyewitnesses, character witnesses and expert witnesses] to parade out to help support and bolster the contentions made on behalf of his or her client in the legal proceeding. The opposing lawyers, on the other hand, will attempt to undermine the physical evidence as ill begotten, tainted and/or misrepresented [Can any of us forget the infamous "blood evidence" in the O.J. Simpson case and the methods employed by Simpson's lawyers to refute its seemingly irrefutable connection to Simpson?]. With live witnesses, however, lawyers are said to try to "impeach" them on cross-examination in order to reduce, minimize or negate entirely the effect of their testimony on the jury. This is usually accomplished by playing a simple game of "Gotcha!" with the witness – i.e., catching the witness in a lie [outright or marginal], changing testimony from prior testimony, significantly embellishing testimony [from prior testimony] or simply noting that the witness' story just does not track with other accepted witness testimony. This can occur unexpectedly by just letting the witness talk and ramble on, or by design, such as when Los Angeles detective, Mark Fuhrman, was caught lying about his use of the infamous "N-word" years before by O.J. Simpson defense attorney, F. Lee Bailey. As a result, Fuhrman's critical testimony about finding a bloody glove [one of two used in the murder of Simpson's former wife and a friend] at Simpson's residence was rendered worthless in the jury's collective mind. Thus, Fuhrman had been "impeached" as a prosecution witness because of his apparent lie about something that had nothing whatsoever to do with the facts of the case being tried.

**Roswell vs. Mogul**

In the case of *Roswell as Evidence of Extraterrestrial Visitation vs. Roswell as Misidentified Project Mogul Balloon*, the same techniques can be brought to bear to try to ferret out what might have taken place back in July of 1947 when the Army Air Force initially reported that it had recovered the remains of a crashed "flying saucer" only to change its story within hours to that of finding the misidentified debris from a downed weather balloon. Since then, a body of documentary evidence and witness testimony has accumulated which has tended to coalesce around two alternate explanations for the Roswell events of July



1947, namely that either an extraterrestrial craft and crew of unknown origin had crashed, was recovered then covered up by the U.S. Government, or that elements of a "balloon train" from a top secret project operating out of Alamogordo, NM known as *Project Mogul* had come to earth and, after first being somehow misidentified as a spaceship, was properly identified for what it was.

### **Nature of the Evidence**

Since there has been no credible, physical evidence yet placed into evidence to consider, we are left with purported, relevant documents as well as 1<sup>st</sup>-, 2<sup>nd</sup>- and 3<sup>rd</sup>-hand witness testimony pertaining to the facts of the case that can be used to support the contentions of either side of the argument. The actual number of uncontested documents that derive from the events at issue is relatively small: the *Roswell Daily Record* articles of July 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 which broke and closed the story [we are not counting here the AP and UP wire stories that subsequently went out to the nation and the world from Roswell, Ft. Worth and Alamogordo as independent documents], an FBI memo of July 8<sup>th</sup> 1947 which told of the shipment of material from Ft. Worth to Wright Field in Dayton, OH, and a brief, semi-humorous item that appeared in a base publication at Roswell Army Air Field, *The Atomic Blast*, in July 1947. Other documents, to be sure, have been put forth and claimed as genuine "Roswell documents" supporting the ET proposition; however, there has been no agreement or acceptance among investigators regarding these, that they are in fact what they are purported to be. The so-called, "MJ-12 Documents" [both the original set which surfaced in the mid-1980's and was researched and declared to be genuine by Stanton Friedman and a second, different set which surfaced in the mid-1990's and is being researched by the father and son team of Ryan and Robert Woods] fall into this category. Also in this category is a hand-written note by FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, written on or around July 15<sup>th</sup> 1947 responding to the question of whether the FBI should be involved in future crash/retrievals of flying discs, perhaps in response to the Roswell crash/recovery. Finally, another document that currently resides in this category is questioned, not because of its provenance [everyone agrees upon that], but because of the variant "readings" of its details by different teams Roswell investigators. We, of course, refer to the, so-called, "Ramey Memo", a portion of a letter, telex or cablegram that General Roger M. Ramey can be seen clutching face-up in his left hand in one of the pictures taken of him by *Ft. Worth Star Telegram* reporter, J. Bond Johnson. There were a total of four pictures taken of Gen. Ramey [two by himself and two with Col. Thomas DuBose] showing him kneeling beside assorted weather balloon and tinfoil radar target debris in his Ft. Worth Army Air Field office on the afternoon of July 8<sup>th</sup> 1947. Since the late 1990's, several teams of investigators have been using a number of computer-enhancement techniques to try to "read" the words and sentences that appear ever so fuzzy in the "memo" shown in the photograph. The results of at least one of these investigations, which has gone far beyond the others, is very encouraging.



To date, there have been no official documents that have come forth that could plausibly be said to link any elements or activities of the *Project Mogul* program with the "Roswell Incident". The only document said to make this connection is a published newspaper article, "Harassed Rancher who Located 'Saucer' Sorry He Told About It" which was published on the front page of the *Roswell Daily Record* on July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947. This article is discussed elsewhere in this paper.

### **Witness Evidence**

With regard to witnesses and witness testimony, the proponents of case that the Roswell events of July 1947 represent the crash/retrieval/cover-up of an extraterrestrial craft and its crew can literally "swamp" the *Mogul* balloon proponents' case by sheer numbers of witnesses alone. The disparity in numbers is simply overwhelming. Beginning with the sheep rancher, William W. "Mack" Brazel who started it all and Jessie Marcel, Sr., the RAAF base intelligence officer who found something in Brazel's pasture that he believed was "not of this earth" and, going forward from there, the number of people contacted by investigators who have provided information pointing to an extraterrestrial explanation for the 1947 Roswell events has escalated into the hundreds. Scores of these have provided written statements; audio taped statements, videotaped statements and notarized statements to this end. A few, to be sure, have subsequently been "impeached" as credible witnesses, having knowingly given false statements to investigators. As a result, their testimonies have had to be discarded. The Roswell mortician, Glenn Dennis, gave investigators a phony name for a nurse in his story of being at the RAAF hospital at the time when preliminary autopsies on alien corpses were allegedly being conducted. Gerald Anderson was caught in numerous false statements and document fabrications when he claimed to have been at a UFO crash site on the Plains of San Agustin in July 1947 as a five-year-old boy. Former Roswell counter intelligence officer, Sheridan Cavitt - who had accompanied Marcel and Brazel back to the Foster Ranch on July 6<sup>th</sup> 1947 and helped Marcel retrieve debris from the crash site - denied to civilian investigators that he had been involved at all while simultaneously confirming such involvement to the Air Force's Col. Richard Weaver in 1994. Without other intervening, corroborating and compelling evidence to support, confirm and resuscitate their stories or otherwise explain their apparent falsehoods, Dennis, Anderson, Cavitt and others [Jim Ragsdale, to name one] must have their respective testimonies discarded *in toto* and given no weight whatsoever.

### **The *Mogul* Configuration**

The advocates on the *Mogul* side of the argument believe that the "Roswell Incident" of July 1947 involved nothing more than the recovery of the misidentified remains of the constituent components from a then top secret, high-altitude balloon project known as *Project Mogul*. The purpose of the project

was to try to detect the expected detonation of the Soviet Union's first atomic bomb by means of balloon-borne, acoustic sensors carried aloft by high-altitude, constant-level balloons. It must be pointed out that, while the project was indeed top secret, its components – most notably the lofting balloons [up to 25 or more in any one "balloon train"] and tinfoil radar ["Rawin"] targets [up to 3 in number] – were not. For the particular *Mogul* flight in question [Flight #4], these would have been ordinary neoprene [rubber] for the former and paper-backed tinfoil, supported by balsa wood sticks, for the latter. The total length of these "balloon trains" reached into the hundreds of feet. Robert Galganski, a civil engineer who has conducted extensive research on the *Mogul* configurations, describes Flight #4 thusly,

*... consisted of 28 neoprene, meteorological-sounding (i.e., weather balloons attached to a 600-foot-long master line of braided nylon cord, three ML-307B rawin radar targets, possibly one or more silk-canopy parachutes, and a variety of test equipment such as a sonobuoy microphone, radio transmitter, dry cells, and plastic containers holding solid and liquid ballast. All components and systems were ordinary off-the-shelf items ...*<sup>1</sup>

The local ranchers, as well as military personnel, were familiar with individual balloon/target configurations which they knew simply as "weather balloons" since they were used so often and crashed so frequently in New Mexico as a result of all of the government and military programs of one sort or another going on there in the years following World War II. Later *Mogul* flights used polyethylene [a clear to whitish, plastic, film-like material] balloons in place of the all-rubber, neoprene, balloon configurations.

### ***Mogul* Physical Evidence?**

There is as yet no physical evidence to connect the *Project Mogul* flights from Alamogordo of May, June or July 1947 directly to the Roswell events of early July 1947. While the authors are currently investigating a number of claims from people who claim to possess material purported to be from the crash wreckage of 1947, none of these match the description of what one would expect to find in a *Mogul* "balloon train". Most match the description of the so-called, "memory metal", described by a number of eyewitnesses as "metal" that was indestructible while at the same time could be wadded-up in one's hand only to see it unfurl itself without a wrinkle when place on a flat surface. It also begs the question of why anyone in their right mind would want to keep a piece of rubber, tape, tinfoil or a stick [all prosaic items] stashed away all these years.

---

<sup>1</sup> Galganski, Robert A., "An Engineer Looks At The Project Mogul Hypothesis", *IUR*, Summer 1998, p. 4



The seven Ft. Worth photographs taken on July 8<sup>th</sup> 1947 in the Ft. Worth office of AAF General, Roger M. Ramey show Maj. Marcel, Gen. Ramey, Col. Thomas DuBose and W.O. Irving Newton all posing with the same tinfoil, sticks and rubber, weather balloon debris. On the one hand, these photographs definitely do not show extraterrestrial, spacecraft debris. On the other hand, there was never any depiction or mention of there having been more than just the one balloon/target found which could put it into the *Project Mogul* category. Further, Maj. Marcel always contended that the rubber, tinfoil and sticks shown in the Ft. Worth photographs were not the real debris that he had recovered from the Foster Ranch, and that the real debris had been switched with the balloon/target "set-up" seen in the photographs taken by Johnson. Col. DuBose also verified the fact that the photographed, balloon/target debris was a cover story cooked-up "...to assuage the curiosity of the press."<sup>2</sup>

### **A Roswell - *Mogul* Nexus?**

It is the memory of Charles B. Moore, a former member of the *Project Mogul* team and a NYU graduate student in 1947 [currently a Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Physics at the NM Institute of Mining and Technology in Socorro], however, that is used to try to establish the all-important link between the Roswell events and the activities of *Project Mogul* then being carried out near Alamogordo, NM at the time. Beginning in the 1990's, Professor Moore apparently had an *epiphany* and somehow remembered that, out of all the *Mogul* launches ever launched, he remembered the details of a single, *Mogul* flight, the one launched on June 4<sup>th</sup> 1947 [Flight #4]! This flight was apparently never recovered and was last seen by the crew of a tracking B-17 in the area of Arabela, NM, not all that far from the Foster Ranch. To this bit of information, the "mogulists" then add the statements attributed to Mack Brazel in the "Harassed Rancher" article that appeared in the July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 edition of the *Roswell Daily Record* in which Brazel appeared to describe his finding the prosaic remains of a weather balloon/tinfoil radar target configuration and not something from "out of this world". Add to these, the statements of former CIC officer at Roswell AAF in 1947, Sheridan Cavitt [now deceased] and Mack Brazel's daughter, Bessie Brazel Schreiber, both of whom claim to have recovered balloon debris in Hines' pasture on the Foster Ranch at the time of the "Roswell Incident", and you have the basis for the *Mogul* case.

### ***Mogul* Witnesses?**

The rancher, Mack Brazel, is long-gone [d. 1963] and was unfortunately never interviewed by Roswell investigators. However, based upon the testimony of family members, friends and neighbors along his dusty trail of life, "Mack" never spoke to them of finding balloon debris on that fateful day in 1947. When he did

---

<sup>2</sup> Videotaped interview of Gen. [Ret.] Thomas DuBose, in "Recollections of Roswell II" [1992], The Fund For UFO Research, Mt. Rainier, MD.



reluctantly speak of those long-ago events, it was usually with an air of bitterness because of his treatment at the hands of the Army Air Force for only doing what he believed to have been was his "patriotic duty". He also would describe for them the exotic nature of what he found, certainly not balloon remains. In fact, it appears that the only times he told of finding a balloon was when he was in the clutches of the military on July 8<sup>th</sup> 1947. The "mogultists" always neglect to mention that Brazel gave the "balloon version" of his story [per the "Harassed Rancher" article] only when he was in military custody and that he **disavowed this version at the end of the very same article!** Later that same day, Brazel confided to KGFL radio announcer, Frank Joyce [who had questioned the obvious change in Brazel's story from that told to him during their first conversation two days before], that it was the military who made him change his story, "or else it will go hard on me."

Regarding the *Mogul* balloon flight of Charles Moore's reed-thin memory [he originally told investigator William Moore that *Mogul* could not have been involved] that today's *Mogul* adherents see as the "silver bullet" to slay the Roswell "beast", some interesting information comes to us from the diary of Dr. Albert Crary who was an acoustics expert for Watson Laboratories in 1947 and was attached to *Project Mogul*. His diary for *Mogul* Flight #4 of June 4<sup>th</sup> 1947 reads, in part:

*No balloon flight again on account of clouds.  
Flew regular sonobuoy mike up in cluster of  
balloons and had good luck on receiver on  
ground but poor on plane.*<sup>3</sup>

What this means to us is that there was no full-configuration, "balloon-train"-type flight that day due to weather conditions. But rather than let the day be a total loss, they decided to launch just the sonobuoy by itself with a cluster of balloons only. **There were no radar targets on this flight**, as it was tracked only *visually* from the ground via theodolite and in the air from the B-17 until it was lost from *sight*. Thus, there would have been no tinfoil, tape or sticks on *Mogul* Flight #4 to stupefy unsuspecting ranchers, intelligence officers and base commanders! Additionally, there were several other rubber, weather balloon and tinfoil, radar target configurations that fell to earth in the United States around the time of the "Roswell Incident", and none of those were ever "misidentified" by the local populace or the military as the remains of a *flying disc* or instigated a chain of events like at Roswell.

---

<sup>3</sup> Saler, Benson, Ziegler, Charles A. and Charles B. Moore, *UFO Crash At Roswell: The Genesis Of A Modern Myth*  
[1997], Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C., p. 83

It turns out that Charles Moore's recent conversion to the *Mogul* Flight #4 cause was recent indeed. Up until the early 1990's, Prof. Moore says that he believed that the Roswell events might have been caused by the crash of one of the polyethylene balloons used later in the *Project Mogul* program. He says he changed his mind, however, after being shown the "Harassed Rancher" article mentioned above which talked about "rubber, tinfoil", "sticks" and "tape" and concluded that it must have been one of the earlier *Mogul* flights that still utilized the neoprene balloons.<sup>4</sup> After a process of elimination, he settled upon Flight #4 as the most likely culprit, based upon a process of elimination using balloon type, launch dates and recovery information only, not upon any known links to Roswell [i.e., all subsequent *Mogul* flights after Flight #4 employing the neoprene balloons prior to the changeover to polyethylene balloons on Flight #8, launched 7/3/47, were known to have been recovered; therefore, the closest launch date to the generally accepted Roswell crash date of 7/4/47 was Flight #4, launched 6/4/47]. It was that simple!

This represents quite a change from Prof. Moore's beliefs on the subject when interviewed in the late 1970's by investigative author, William Moore, for the book, *The Roswell Incident* [1980]. When asked by William Moore if the Roswell "device" might have been "a weather balloon or other scientific balloon" [NOTE: the name of the project that Charles Moore had worked on, *Project Mogul*, was not known to either Moore at the time of this interview, but the term, "other scientific balloon" would certainly seem to have included *Project Mogul* "devices" in Charles Moore's mind], Charles Moore replied, *"Based on the description you [William Moore] just gave me [these were no doubt those of Jesse Marcel, Sr., Bill Brazel, Jr. and a few others], I can definitely rule this out. There wasn't a balloon in use back in '47 . . . that could have produced debris over such a large area or torn up the ground in any way [a reference to the "gouge" reported by Bill Brazel, Jr. and a few others who visited the debris field on the Foster Ranch]. I have no idea what such an object might have been, but I can't believe a balloon would fit such a description."* With regard to the tinfoil, radar targets used with ordinary weather balloon flights at the time [and, as it turns out, on the *Project Mogul* flights, as well], Charles Moore felt strongly that [to paraphrase], *"anyone finding such 'flimsy foil and balsa-wood material' would have great difficulty in confusing it with anything out of the ordinary."* Right you are professor, but apparently you no longer believe your own words. Either that, or you underestimated the stupidity and ineptness of our country's most elite military unit in 1947, the 509<sup>th</sup> Bomb Group, the only unit in the world charged with delivering the atomic bomb. In retrospect, a scary thought, if the professor is right. In any event, Charles Moore's testimony concerning Roswell has changed significantly over time and should be discounted accordingly.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, pp. 74 – 114



### **An Unimpeachable Witness for *Project Mogul*?**

Unlike the pro-Roswell advocates who have a deep witness pool from which to draw, the proponents of the *Project Mogul* hypothesis have only a very few alleged witnesses - you can count them on the fingers of one hand - that they cite to try to bolster their case. Thus, these same alleged witnesses are used over and over again by the *Project Mogul* Advocates because that is all they have. Charles Moore has already been mentioned, but he really did not witness anything, and his role in the Roswell events is not that of an eyewitness but that of an "expert witness". Irving Newton of Ramey photograph fame is used, but only narrowly to try to undermine the testimony of Jesse Marcel, Sr., since Newton does not believe that the debris from a *Mogul* "balloon train" was involved in Roswell either.

There are only four alleged eyewitnesses who have come forward to say that they were on the ground at the Brazel debris field on the Foster Ranch in July 1947 and that what they saw there consisted of crashed balloon and/or radar target debris - not the remains of anything else and certainly not the remains of a spaceship. The first of these, Walt Whitmore, Jr., the deceased son of the former owner of Roswell radio station KGFL, has told researchers two completely opposite accounts of being at the debris field as to "impeach" himself up-front as a credible witness. A second, AP reporter Jason Kellahin (dec.), described a site location and scenario so different from anyone else who was there as to be dismissed outright. The third of these was the late Roswell AAF Counter Intelligence Corps officer, Lt. Col. [Ret.] Sheridan Cavitt, who, as we stated above, has been "impeached" as a credible witness for knowingly telling falsehoods about his role in the Roswell events. For a complete review of this alleged eyewitness and his involvement in the "Roswell Incident", please refer to an article written by the lead author herein, "Will the Real Sheridan Cavitt, Please Stand Up?" [*IUR*, Fall 1998].

**Comes now the witness, Bessie Brazel Schreiber, daughter of deceased Corona rancher, William Ware "Mack" Brazel, and who claims to have accompanied her father and younger brother, Vernon Brazel, to a certain pasture on the J.B. Foster Ranch where it had been reported that a 'flying saucer' had crashed and had been recovered by the Army Air Force in early July of the year of our Lord, 1947. What say you?**

Now sixty-nine years old, Bessie Brazel [Schreiber] was fourteen at the time of the "Roswell Incident". Identified as "Betty" in the July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 "Harassed Rancher" article in the *Roswell Daily Record* mentioned above in which her father spoke of recovering and then not recovering a weather balloon, she was said in the article to have accompanied her father and younger brother, Vernon, as well



as her mother ["Maggie"] to the crash site in Hines' Pasture on the J.B. Foster Ranch to help gather up the wreckage. Over a twenty-year period, beginning in 1979, Bessie Brazel Schreiber [hereinafter referred to as "BBS"] has been interviewed a total of five times [known to the authors] about her role and, more importantly, her observations concerning what she allegedly witnessed in Hines' Pasture that day. She has also provided a signed and notarized AFFIDAVIT memorializing her recollections of it. Since her original account to William Moore, given in 1979 and which appeared in *The Roswell Incident*, BBS has become an outspoken champion of the "balloon explanation" for the Roswell events of 1947, as well as the only living, alleged, first-hand eyewitness to the debris remains at the crash site who has made that claim [Sheridan Cavitt is now deceased]. As a result, her account has appeared prominently in every Roswell-debunking/*Project Mogul*-promoting book ever published. These include, *Roswell in Perspective* [technically, not a book, but a monograph], by Karl Pflock, the Fund for UFO Research [1994], the U.S. Air Force's various *Roswell Report(s)*, by Richard Weaver and James McAndrew, U.S. Government Printing Office [1994, 1995, 1997], *The Real Roswell Crashed-Saucer Cover-up*, by Phil Klass, Prometheus Books [1997], *The Roswell UFO Crash: What They Don't Want You to Know*, by Kal Korff, Prometheus Books [1997], *UFO Crash At Roswell: The Genesis Of A Modern Myth*, by Benson Saler, Charles Ziegler and Charles Moore, Smithsonian Institution Press [1997] and most recently, *Roswell: Inconvenient Facts and the Will to Believe*, by Karl Pflock, Prometheus Books [2001].

Outside of the works by Karl Pflock who interviewed BBS in August of 1993, the rest of the publications cited above rely heavily upon William Moore's original interview of BBS in 1979 that appeared in *The Roswell Incident* and her notarized AFFIDAVIT of September 1993 for the details of her story. In the hope of clarifying and enhancing the details of her account, the authors met with and questioned BBS at length in her home on the afternoon of May 22, 1999 [by agreement with BBS, we are not at liberty to divulge her address]. Also present at the interview were BBS's husband, Jim [now deceased], and Paul Davids, executive producer of the 1994 movie, *Roswell*.

### **Another Look at Bessie's Story**

To focus on and contrast BBS's testimony as given to various researchers over the years, we will identify at which particular interview a statement cited by us below was given. These will be indicated by the year in which and the researcher(s) to whom it was given. Using this format, let us examine the statements of this alleged, key eyewitness for content and consistency regarding salient points in her recollections concerning the Roswell events of July 1947 and offer our comments as well.

### ***Was she there?***

When informed of his sister's story of being on the Foster Ranch with their father and little brother to help clean up the wreckage left by whatever had crashed there during the first week of July 1947, Bill Brazel, Jr. bellowed to the interviewers, Kevin Randle and Don Schmitt, "What?!! She wasn't even there!" This interview took place in 1989 and was Randle's and Schmitt's first with BBS. If true, we must discard BBS's account of the Roswell events up-front and need not go any further. However, Bill, Jr. was already on record in *The Roswell Incident* as saying that two of the children, that would be Bessie and Vernon, were with their father the night of the lightning storm when their father heard the strange explosion. He even went further by saying that their father had dropped them off in Tularosa where the family lived with their mother on his way to Roswell to report his find. Again, when informed of these statements attributed to him in *The Roswell Incident*, Bill, Jr. stated to Randle and Schmitt that these were total misquotes, that he never said them. For her part, BBS has been consistent over the years in maintaining that she was at the ranch with her little brother [Vernon, 7] and her mother visiting their father after school had let out for the summer. She said that they did this every summer. The "Harassed Rancher" article mentioned above also stated much the same thing with the exception that according to BBS, her mother did not help in the cleanup. However, pressing BBS further during their 1989 interview with her, Randle and Schmitt asked BBS about the apparent loneliness of being a 14 year-old girl spending the summer on a ranch way out in the middle of nowhere with no telephone, no electricity and the nearest neighbors 10 miles away, not to mention the lack of friends her own age, especially boys, to associate with. BBS's 1989 comment to Randle and Schmitt regarding this bleak scenario was, "That's why I didn't go."

COMMENT: Unfortunately, except for Bill Brazel, Jr., all other family members who might be able to shed some light on just who was and who wasn't there at the time of the July 1947 incident have passed away.

### ***Who was with her father when he made his discovery?***

Although the aforementioned *Roswell Daily Record* "Harassed Rancher" article of July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 which was probably written by a local reporter named Skeritt <sup>5</sup> stated that Mack Brazel was with his son, Vernon, when he made his fateful discovery, BBS has maintained over the years that no one was with her father at the time. It was Brazel's nearest neighbors, Floyd [dec.] and Loretta Proctor who lived 10 miles away, who first said that their then 8 year-old son Timothy "Dee" Proctor was with Mack at the time of discovery. This has since been confirmed to researchers by a number of other ranchers who knew both the Proctors and the

---

<sup>5</sup> Rudiak, David, *personal communication*, 8/19/01.



Brazels and who said that "Dee" would often spend time with Mack Brazel on the Foster Ranch. "Dee" Proctor is still alive but, unfortunately, has eluded researchers all these years and has never been interviewed. Such an interview could no doubt go a long way towards resolving many of the outstanding issues surrounding the Roswell events. In a 1993 interview with Karl Pflock, BBS held open the door to the possibility that someone else could have been with her father, but in her 1999 interview with the authors, that door seems to have closed ["No. There was no one else. Period!"]. Regarding "Dee" Proctor, whom she remembers only as a, "snot-nosed kid", she is almost defiant in this belief. When pressed, however, BBS did admit to the authors that something could have taken place in the Hines Pasture, which was 8-10 miles from the ranch house where she allegedly was staying with the rest of her family, and she wouldn't have known about it.

COMMENT: Conflicting testimony on a key point with no way to resolve it without the testimony of the still-living, alleged eyewitness, "Dee" Proctor. So far, however, Proctor has been able to avoid Roswell investigators seeking to interview him. BBS continues to state that no one was with her father at the time of discovery, while "Dee" Proctor's relatives maintain that he was. In the end, however, BBS seems to have still left open that very possibility.

### ***What was the date of Mack Brazel's discovery?***

The original work on the subject, *The Roswell Incident*, put the date of the alleged UFO crash as the evening of July 2<sup>nd</sup> 1947. This was based upon a melding of several bits of information known to the investigators at the time: (1) the original press release distributed to the Roswell media on July 8<sup>th</sup> 1947 by Lt. Walter Haut, the RAAF's Public Information Officer, stated that the crash had occurred "sometime last week" [that would make it sometime between June 29<sup>th</sup> and July 5<sup>th</sup>]; (2) the July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 AP press release from Ft. Worth which carried the "Gen. Ramey Empties Roswell Saucer" story stated that the recovery took place "several days ago"; (3) interviews with surviving Brazel family members and friends revealed that Mack had told them he had heard a strange explosion during a severe thunder and lightning storm late one evening in early July 1947 and went out *the following day* to check on his sheep when he made his fateful discovery; and (4) according to the "RAAF Captures Flying Saucer . . ." story in the *Roswell Daily Record* of July 8<sup>th</sup> 1947, the only "flying disk" sightings reported up to that point in Roswell was one by a couple, Mr. and Mrs. Dan Wilmot, who reported seeing a "large, glowing object" in the night sky from their porch around 10 PM the evening of July 2<sup>nd</sup> traveling rapidly from the southeast over Roswell to the northwest. Combining the Wilmot sighting with the other information, William Moore and Charles Berlitz came up with a crash date of July 2<sup>nd</sup> 1947 and a discovery date [by Brazel] of July 3<sup>rd</sup> 1947. Randle and Schmitt continued this crash/discovery timeline in their first Roswell book, *UFO Crash at*



*Roswell* [1991]. But, by 1994, they had interviewed new witnesses and came up with a new date for the crash - July 4<sup>th</sup> 1947 - which meant that Brazel's initial discovery, allowing for Marcel's and Cavitt's overnight trip to the Foster Ranch and back to the base in Roswell in time for the July 8<sup>th</sup> announcement that the RAAF had captured a "flying saucer", had to have taken place the following day, on Saturday, July 5<sup>th</sup> 1947. This timeline was played out in Randle's and Schmitt's second Roswell book, *The Truth about the UFO at Roswell*, published in 1994. The Air Force, meanwhile, was officially adopting the suggestion of UFO researchers, Robert Todd and Karl Pflock that a *Project Mogul* "balloon train" was at the heart of the "Roswell Incident" and not something extraterrestrial. The Air Force also stuck with a June 14<sup>th</sup> 1947 discovery of the debris date by Mack Brazel as put forth in the "Harassed Rancher . . ." article in the July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 *Roswell Daily Record*. The Air Force, like Pflock [apparently casting aside his earlier doubts of a mid-June discovery date] and Charles Moore, then fished around for a neoprene [rubber], balloon, *Mogul* launch prior to and closest to June 14<sup>th</sup> 1947 that was never recovered and *voila!* came up with *Mogul* Launch #4 of June 4<sup>th</sup> 1947 as the "culprit". All of the Roswell debunking books, as well as the official Air Force reports on Roswell, follow this timeline.

In their 1999 interview with Bessie Brazel Schreiber, the authors asked her about the possibility of a June 14<sup>th</sup> 1947 discovery date by her father. "No, ... that is not so ...it was in July", was her quick reply to that suggestion. Why? "Because you would not leave stuff [the crash debris] laying out there for a month ... with live stock out there." Especially near a water hole that was the only source of water for their sheep [Mack Brazel had reported that his sheep would not cross the debris field to get to the watering station]. "We had to pick all of that stuff up because sheep are stupid." What was the *real* discovery date by her father, according to BBS? July the 3<sup>rd</sup> 1947. Why? Because, as BBS recounted, her father had gone out to check the stock and came back late in the evening with some of the debris with him, complaining that the sheep would not water. He told the rest of the family present that they had to clean the stuff up. But, "The next day was the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. Well, in that country, you don't work on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. You go to the rodeo [in Capitan] on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July." So, the actual cleanup of the debris site, according to BBS, took place "bright and early" on Saturday morning, July the 5<sup>th</sup>. Lending support to a July 3<sup>rd</sup> discovery date is Loretta Proctor, Mack Brazel's nearest neighbor 10 miles distant, who maintains that her son, Dee [age 7 in 1947], had accompanied Mack on that fateful day of discovery. According to Loretta, her son was in the habit of spending time at the Foster Ranch helping Mack with his daily routine. Although BBS now says this definitely did not happen, she told Karl Pflock in a 1993 interview that it was a possibility [remember her 1999 statement to the authors that it was entirely possible that something could happen on other parts of the ranch, away from the ranch house, and she would not know about it]. Also, neighbors of the Proctors and Brazels confirmed to Randle and Schmitt that Dee did in fact often spend time

with Mack. Further, Loretta Proctor told Schmitt several years ago that, when Mack Brazel showed her and her husband Floyd a small piece of the strange debris that Mack had found and also tried unsuccessfully to get the Proctors to return to the debris field with him to look at it, the occasion was Mack's returning their son back home to them in time for the rodeo in Capitan the next day [the 4<sup>th</sup> of July]. Further, an AP story in the *Albuquerque Journal* and the *San Antonio Express* quotes Chaves County Sheriff, George Wilcox, as saying that Brazel had told him that he had made the discovery two or three days before coming to Wilcox's office.<sup>6</sup> Finally, Mack Brazel, according to Bill Rickett of the Roswell base's CIC office, apparently told them that he made his find on the morning of July 3<sup>rd</sup>.

COMMENT: It appears that a discovery date of June 14<sup>th</sup> 1947 for Mack Brazel's finding of the strange debris on the Foster Ranch is illegitimate and cannot be sustained. Perhaps it was a date that was simply plucked out of the air for use in the "Harassed Rancher ..." newspaper article of July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 wherein Mack Brazel told of finding – then not finding – a downed weather balloon. Who picked that date, and why it was picked at the time, we shall probably never know. There is no support for this date in the accumulated Roswell testimony, even that of Bessie Brazel Schreiber, a "balloon believer". When one considers that the timeline of the current *Project Mogul* explanation for the Roswell events of early July, 1947 is derived from a June 14<sup>th</sup> discovery date, it is not a stretch to suggest that if that date falls, so does *Project Mogul* as "the answer" to Roswell. We believe that to be the case. The "mogulists" have placed all of their collective "eggs" in the June 4<sup>th</sup> "launch-basket" and cannot now "fish" for yet another launch date that might work. Sorry, fellas. Too late for that now. Testimony would appear to support the discovery of the debris by Mack Brazel on Thursday July 3<sup>rd</sup> 1947, with the actual crash itself taking place late the evening before. This marks a return by the authors to a crash date of July 2<sup>nd</sup> 1947 as originally postulated in *The Roswell Incident* [1980] and a break with the July 4<sup>th</sup> crash date as suggested by Randle and Schmitt in *The Truth about the UFO Crash at Roswell* [1994].

### ***How much debris was found?***

Maj. Jesse A. Marcel, the RAAF's senior Intelligence Officer, visited the debris field site for the first time on the morning of July 7<sup>th</sup> 1947 along with the Roswell base's senior Counter Intelligence Officer, Capt. Sheridan Cavitt, and Mack Brazel. Marcel described the extent of what he saw as a field of densely packed, thin, aluminum foil-like debris that was scattered over an area approximately 3/4<sup>th</sup>s of a mile long by several hundred feet wide [i.e., approximately one million square feet or the area encompassed by 22 football fields if we use the 200-300

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.



ft. wide figure mentioned so often].<sup>7</sup> Recall that the debris was spaced sufficiently close together that, according to Mack Brazel, his sheep would not cross the field to obtain much needed water in the hot New Mexico summer. The location and extent of the debris field was confirmed by Bill Brazel, Jr. who pointed it out to us [his father had shown him its location], a neighbor, Bud Payne [dec.] who did the same, as did a former ranch hand on the Foster Ranch, Tommy Tyree, and others. According to them, it was located in the Hines Draw [or pasture] about a mile from the sheep's surface watering station. The purple sweep of the Capitan Mountains still overlooks the area today much as it did in 1947. Marcel talked about filling up Cavitt's Jeep Carry-all as well as his '42 Buick with as much debris as they could and driving back to Roswell [an excited Marcel would make an early A.M., impromptu visit at his Roswell home first, however, to show his wife and young son the strange material he believed was "not from this earth"]. He later talked about it being transported by plane ["half a B-29 full"] to Ft. Worth, TX on July the 8<sup>th</sup> for the infamous Ramey "press conference".<sup>8</sup> This, according to Marcel, was only a small portion of the total debris from the site, as it would take cleanup crews several more days to "sweep" Hines Draw clean. Jesse Marcel, Jr. has also confirmed that his father told him that the debris brought home that morning from the crash site by his father was but a small portion of the total debris that still remained on the ground at the Foster Ranch.<sup>9</sup>

In a 1994 STATEMENT OF WITNESS given to the Air Force's chief Roswell researcher, Col. Richard L. Weaver, Lt. Col. [Ret.] Sheridan Cavitt [d. 1999], the former Roswell CIC Captain who had accompanied Maj. Marcel out to the Foster Ranch debris field, said that the debris was not scattered, but concentrated in a small area, "very small, about 20 feet square" [i.e., about 400 square feet or less than 1% the total area of a football field]. According to Cavitt, "There certainly wasn't a lot of this material ... which would fit easily into one vehicle." His description of the relatively small recovery site would seem to be most consistent with that for a downed weather balloon, which Cavitt said he immediately recognized as such. For its part, the "Harassed Rancher ..." article in the July 9th *Roswell Daily Record* put the area encompassed by the balloon debris at a diameter of 200 yards [i.e., just under 300,000 square feet or about the area of 6 football fields].

Interviewed by Moore and Friedman in 1979 for *The Roswell Incident*, BBS's only reference to the amount of debris found was a non-committal, "... so much debris scattered over pastureland." Nothing specific as to the area encompassed or the amount of debris involved. In her 1993 AFFIDAVIT, however, she was a little more specific; "There was *a lot of debris* [emphasis added] scattered sparsely over an area that seems to me now to have been about the size of a

---

<sup>7</sup> Moore, William and Charles Berlitz, *The Roswell Incident* [1980], Grosset & Dunlap, New York, p. 63

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 67

<sup>9</sup> Various videotaped interviews and public statements.



football field [i.e., about 45,000 square feet]. There may have been additional material spread out more widely by the wind, which was blowing quite strongly." This sounds like quite a bit of material, and BBS said that it took her, her father [Mack] and little brother [Vernon] several hours to gather it all up. However, she then said that it all fit into in just three burlap feed sacks, which doesn't sound like a lot of stuff. She also for the first time stated that the debris was concentrated near the surface watering station and that this prevented the sheep from watering there. In our interview of her in 1999, she expanded on this theme, "... most of it [the debris] was in this area around the surface water tank ... that's why it was so crucial that we get it picked up ... because it was close to a water hole ... you wouldn't leave the stuff laying out there for a month ... with livestock out there ... because that was their only source of water." After initially stating once again to us that the debris field itself was "large", she then retreated from that theme, as well as from the "large amount of debris" theme, "... we did the whole area because that particular pasture was not that big" and, "*There wasn't that much stuff.*" [emphasis added]. According to her, when they had finished picking up all of the debris, they went back to the ranch house and placed the three gunnysacks under the porch for storage. When the military arrived at the ranch a day or two later, they handed over the gunnysacks to the them, and her father took two officers [presumably Marcel and Cavitt] out to the Hines Draw to show them where the stuff had been picked up. While that was going on, the rest of the military contingent of about 15 men waited back at the ranch house sipping lemonade made for them fresh by her mother. When her father and the officers returned, Mrs. Brazel, according to BBS, treated everyone to a dinner of fried chicken, mashed potatoes, gravy and hot biscuits!

COMMENT: Clearly, the balloon proponents, whether of the weather or *Mogul* type, have a problem here as their witnesses are clearly "not on the same page" when it comes to the size of the debris field involved in the Roswell events. They are "all over the lot" on this issue and can't seem to make up their minds. Cavitt, with years to prepare, definitely was talking about the recovery of a single weather balloon [presumably the very same one displayed by Gen. Ramey on the floor of his office in the infamous July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 Ft. Worth photographs taken by J. Bond Johnson], so the small debris area described by him for Col. Weaver seems to be a nice fit for his story. Standing by itself, therefore, it seems to "jive". Readers will recall, however, that Cavitt was telling Weaver this at the very time he was telling civilian Roswell researchers another story, first denying that he was ever stationed at Roswell, then that he was indeed stationed there but **not involved at all** in the Roswell events. And, if BBS is to be believed, there was nothing for Marcel and Cavitt to recover from the pasture in the first place since she, her father and little brother had picked up and placed all the debris in gunny sacks a day or two prior to his arrival at the ranch! Which is it? As any good lawyer would say, "was Cavitt lying or is BBS lying?" As for the "Harassed Rancher ..." article of July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947, it too seemed to be describing the

find of a single balloon. "Mogulists" will say that, because the article mentioned that "scotch-tape with flowers printed on it" had been found amongst the debris [such flowery tape is claimed to have been used in the construction of some *Mogul* radar targets], the article must have been describing the remains of a *Project Mogul* balloon and radar target from a downed "balloon train" [Flight #4, to be exact] out of Alamogordo. BBS, seeming to support the article, also mentioned to Moore and Friedman in 1979 of seeing tape with "pastel flowers" embossed on it amongst the debris. Unlike Cavitt's story, however, and perhaps reflecting the rush of events at the time, as well as not thinking everything through, the size of the debris field mentioned in the article seems much, much too large for the recovery of the single, nearly intact balloon and target shown in the Ramey photographs. Also, after searching for years, now with sophisticated computer enhancement techniques, the "flowery scotch-tape" so highly trumpeted as evidence of *Mogul* involvement, has yet to reveal itself to investigators in the Ramey photographs, or anywhere else, for that matter.

For her part in this discussion, BBS seems to have started out big but has since gotten smaller as the years have gone by. In this case, "bigger" [as in the amount of debris found and the size of the debris field] tends to support the original statements of Mack Brazel, Jesse Marcel, Sr. and others that what was found so long ago in Hines Draw was most likely extraterrestrial in origin, while "smaller" [for the same reasons] tends to indicate a balloon recovery of some sort. In the process, BBS has done damage to her cause and to that of the *Project Mogul* proponents. By her statements in the 1979 interview with Moore and Friedman which appeared in *The Roswell Incident*, she seemed to be giving tacit support to elements of both her father's original account [and, by extension, to that of Jesse Marcel, Sr.] of finding a *large amount of strange* debris over a widespread area in the Hines Draw as well as to elements of her father's public account that appeared in the "Harassed Rancher ..." article. In her 1993 AFFIDAVIT [filed one month after being interviewed by *Mogul* proponent, Karl Pflock], BBS moved the debris field out of Hines Draw and up close to the surface water tank a mile away, and the debris itself was now concentrated in a smaller [but not as small as Cavitt's 20 ft. square], 45,000 sq. ft., football field-sized area which was more in tune with the recovery of parts of a "balloon train", but still too large for the recovery of a single balloon/target. Her original descriptions of some of the more exotic elements of the debris that appeared in *The Roswell Incident* had also disappeared from her new story. She was now clearly describing the crash/retrieval of balloon and possibly a radar target. Specifically, her position today is that a balloon had either "burst" above ground or upon striking the ground resulting in its instant disintegration into many, small pieces – none larger than the diameter of a basketball – which then came to rest in an area the size of a football field near the surface water tank in question. It was the small size of the individual, debris pieces that enabled her and her family to stuff them into gunnysacks. Leaving aside the question as to just how a radar



target would "burst", recall that BBS first saw the debris only 2 days after her father found it or long before any degradation of its parts [a key requisite of the *Mogul* Explanation] would have been possible. It will also come as no surprise to the reader who already knows from experience that, when a balloon bursts, it does not disintegrate into little pieces. Rather, except for the area of weakness at the "blowout" hole, the rest of the balloon remains essentially intact. She paints an improbable scenario, to say the least. But in doing so, BBS inadvertently "takes out" a key theory of those she wishes to help. By "deep-sixing" the June 14<sup>th</sup> discovery date of the debris by her father, and for the reasons she has stated [having to do with the daily, crucial necessity of watering livestock], BBS "drives a stake into the heart" of the chances of *Project Mogul* Flight #4, launched on June 4<sup>th</sup> 1947, being the source of the material found by her father.

Suggesting that BBS indeed kept up with or was briefed on developments regarding Roswell, she aggressively took issue in her 1993 AFFIDAVIT with several items that appeared in Randle's and Schmitt's 1991 book, *UFO Crash at Roswell*, by formally disputing the claims that a 500 ft.-long "gouge" [presumably made by the "touchdown" of the stricken ET craft] or a "burned area" [another alleged ET "touchdown" point] were ever found at or near the debris field location. She reiterated these alleged observations again to the authors during our 1999 interview.

What of the possibility that Mack Brazel [through Bill Brazel, Jr.], Bud Payne and Jesse Marcel, Sr. were correct in their estimates of the amount of debris and the size of the debris field? Is it possible that Sheridan Cavitt and Bessie Brazel Schreiber were headed in the right direction with their accounts but just didn't have it quite right? In other words, leaving aside the question of which flight might qualify, could the observed Hines Draw debris have resulted from the crash of a complete or nearly complete *Project Mogul* "balloon train"? *Mogul* Flight #4, the reader will recall, consisted of 28 neoprene balloons strung out along its 600 ft. length, with 3 tinfoil, radar targets in addition to the payloads. Could this be what Brazel and Marcel really saw? No matter how they try to "slice and dice" it, the answer still comes out a resounding, "No". Published studies analyzing the maximum amount of debris potentially available from a *Mogul* "balloon train" have confirmed the fact that there was nowhere near enough *Mogul* material to account for the debris reported by Brazel, Marcel and others [see, e.g., "The Roswell Debris: A Quantitative Evaluation of the Project Mogul Hypothesis" by Robert Galganski, *IUR*, March/April 1995; "A Project Engineer Looks at the Project Mogul Hypothesis" by Robert Galganski, *IUR*, Summer 1998; "The Roswell Debris Field: Size Doesn't Matter" by Robert Galganski, *IUR*, Winter 2000-01; and "Mogul Flight #4? Not Enough 'Foil' to Go Around" by Neil Morris and Ron Regehr, *MUFON UFO Journal*, February 2000]. The reaction of the "mogulists" to this basic flaw in their hypothesis has been to simply ignore it.



Ignoring the obvious, intentional or otherwise is known in the vernacular as, "whistling past the graveyard".

### ***What did the debris consist of?***

Although Mack Brazel's only first-hand utterances about the nature of what he found that day in his pasture come to us by way of the "Harassed Rancher . . ." article of July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947, namely that he found [but, in the end, *didn't really find*] the remains of a ordinary weather balloon, his family, neighbors and others have told us what he grudgingly told them in bits and pieces [no pun intended] about it in the ensuing years prior to his death in 1963 as well as what they, in some cases, witnessed themselves. These statements, combined with those of a number of military witnesses who saw and/or handled the debris - most notably Jesse Marcel, Sr., Louis "Bill" Rickett and Robert Smith, allow for the identification of nine different types of debris ranging from the most numerous types - the palm-sized, light-as-a-feather, wafer-thin yet indestructible and unbendable, "aluminum foil" and the equally indestructible, fabric-like "metal" which one could wad-up in one's hand only to have it unfurl itself upon release [the so-called, "memory-metal"], to the less numerous monofilament "wires", the small "I-beams" with strange symbols on them, a brown, parchment-like material, the black, "bakelite" material, a number of light brown, beam-like shards [not "I-beams"] as well as an individual seamless, black box and a likewise seamless, aluminum-like "collar" or "strut".

Three hours after first declaring to the world that it had recovered the downed wreckage of a "flying saucer", the Army Air Force officially announced on the afternoon of July 8<sup>th</sup> 1947 that the Foster Ranch "disk" was nothing more than the misidentified remains of an common weather balloon and a tinfoil, radar target. In an AP wire-story the next day, newspapers across the land carried the official Air Force description of that debris as a, "bundle of tinfoil, broken wood beams and rubber remnants of a balloon . . ." The *Roswell Daily Record* provided even more detail in the "Harassed Rancher . . ." article. In it, Mack Brazel [under detention by the Air Force at the time] spoke of finding, "a large area of bright wreckage made up of rubber strips, tinfoil, a rather tough paper and sticks." The rubber strips were "smoky gray" in color and scattered all over the area of the debris field as if it had exploded in the sky rather than being dragged across the terrain. There were no strings or wires that would be expected in a balloon/target device, but the article did say that there were "eyelets" in the "paper" suggesting an attachment to something else. Some of the debris, curiously, was said to contain individual letters but no complete words. And, finally, the description that clinched it for the "mogulists": "Considerable scotch tape and some tape with flowers printed upon it had been used in the construction." The entire "ball of wax", according to the article, comprised two

bundles after being gathered up – the rubber debris made one bundle 8"- 20" long x 8" thick, and the rest of the debris another bundle about 36" long x 7"- 8" thick. Together, both bundles weighed about five pounds. This description, supported by the alleged eyewitness testimonies of former CIC Captain, Sheridan Cavitt and Bessie Brazel Schreiber as well as the information provided by former *Project Mogul* member, Charles Moore, forms the core of the current Air Force position regarding the Roswell events of July, 1947.

In his 1994 interview with the Air Force's Col. Weaver, Cavitt said that he *immediately* recognized the Foster Ranch remains concentrated in a small area as that of a weather balloon. There was no doubt about it in his mind. But, what about BBS? Was she always as *sure* of the balloon explanation as she seemed during her 1999 interview with the authors? In her 1979 interview with William Moore, she seemed to be betwixt and between in her statements, that is supporting both versions of what her father said he found. Reminiscent of the Air Force version, she described the wreckage then as, "... pieces of heavily waxed paper and a sort of aluminum-like foil. Some of the pieces had something like numbers and lettering on them, but there were no words that we were able to make out. Some of the metal-foil pieces had a sort of tape stuck to them, and when these were held to the light they showed what looked like pastel flowers or designs ..." Then seeming to switch her support to her father, she described some of the more exotic properties of the wreckage, "Even though the stuff looked like tape, it could not be peeled off or removed at all ... there sure was a lot of it ... [the writing] looked like numbers mostly, at least I assumed them to be numbers. They were written out like you would write numbers in columns to do an addition problem. But they didn't look like numbers we use at all. What gave me the idea they were numbers, I guess, was the way they were all ranged out in columns." When asked by William Moore in 1979 if what she had allegedly seen were the remains of a weather balloon, BBS answered then, **"No. It was definitely not a balloon"** [emphasis added]. BBS added that she had seen lots of weather balloons and had found a Japanese balloon [bomb?] as well as balloons with instrument packages. But, **"This was nothing like that. I have never seen anything resembling this sort of thing before – or since."**<sup>10</sup> [emphasis added]

By the early 1990's, however, her story had dramatically changed. In her 1993 AFFIDAVIT, submitted to the Fund for UFO Research one month after being interviewed by *Project Mogul* proponent, Karl Pflock, BBS now described what she and her family had found as, "... like pieces of a large *balloon* [emphasis added] which had burst." These were described as mostly small pieces of material the color of silver-gray. The pieces were said to be of a double-sided material, "foil-like on one side and rubber-like on the other." which could not be

---

<sup>10</sup> Moore and Berlitz, p. 87



torn. To this, BBS added the finding of "kite sticks" attached to the debris [not mentioned in her first account], and her previous mention of an indestructible type of tape now became reminiscent of the tape alleged to have been employed on some *Project Mogul* radar targets for reinforcement, "whitish tape two or three inches wide [with] flower designs on it ... in a variety of pastel colors which reminded [her] of Japanese paintings ..." That was it as BBS said that there were no other types of debris found. No mention this time of "waxed paper", pieces of debris with individual "letters" and rows of "numbers" on them. Gone completely from her story. She did go out of her way to point out, however, that there were no gouges in the ground as alleged by her brother and others that would have suggested that something had struck the ground hard. All in all, according to her and her father, it was, "just a bunch of garbage."

In her 1999 interview with the authors, BBS stuck with her balloon story, but with new details in an obvious [to us] attempt to try to reconcile discrepancies in her prior versions. In this effort, some of her explanations almost seemed scripted as if she had been coached and was repeating words memorized for a speech rather than recalled from memory. The airburst, large balloon of 1993 had now morphed into, "something had either burst and came to the ground or burst when it hit the ground." She now described the material on the ground as "kite-like" which at first sounded like a tinfoil, radar target but turned out to be something else. Instead of tinfoil, BBS now stated that the material reminded her of the silvery "Mylar balloons that we have now". Asked by Schmitt if this material would "spring-back" when crumpled [like the so-called "memory-metal" described by a number of eyewitnesses], she said that it did. Also present was, "some rubbery type stuff ... like the real heavy – not as heavy as an inner tube – but heavier than a balloon." Not sure at this point just what BBS was describing, Carey then asked her, "Did you think it was a balloon?" Answer: "Yep, because that's what Dad said he thought it was. So, that's what I thought it was." [?!] This was because, as BBS now told us, contrary to her earlier statements, that she had never found a balloon prior to this occasion. Only her father had. Carey reminded her of her original statement to William Moore in 1979 when she told Moore that what she saw was no balloon. Her response now was that she had meant that it wasn't a *weather* balloon but a "**high altitude balloon**" [emphasis added]; " ... because they had balloons from Holloman and probably from Sandia too that were not quote, 'weather balloons'. I don't know exactly what they were, but now we had picked up a lot of weather balloons out there – or rather my Dad did – but they were of a *different material* than this one [emphasis added]. This was ... a high altitude balloon." And unlike her "bunch of garbage" comment of just a few years earlier, which would lead one to question why her father would travel all the way to Roswell to report it in the first place, this find, "... was different from anything we had picked up before. So, we thought that maybe it was important to somebody." She also mentioned to us the "aluminum collar with a flange" and the "tape with flowers", but no "sticks" this time. She

added that she understood that a toy company had manufactured the tape. Referring back to her 1979 statements to William Moore, Carey asked her about the exotic "rows of numbers" she had described for Moore on some of the pieces of debris. "I don't recall anything like that."

COMMENT: Like us, the reader should be struck by the "evolution" of BBS's alleged eyewitness testimony longitudinally over the years. It seems to have evolved as knowledge of the details of the case has evolved. In her 1979 account, she generally followed the story line as it appeared in the "Harassed Rancher ..." article in the *Roswell Daily Record* of July 9<sup>th</sup> 1947 by combining the more mundane elements of the article, such as "waxed paper", "tape with pastel flowers" and "aluminum foil" along with the more exotic elements – i.e., individual letters but no words [her father had referred to these privately as "wiggles" and "figures"] which she had assumed to be "numbers" of some sort. She also supported her father's final statement in the "Harassed Rancher ..." article by telling Moore that the debris she witnessed was definitely not that of a balloon. One can see, therefore, that her entire early account conforms almost entirely with the public record as she knew it at the time.

By 1993, three pro-ET non-fiction and one fiction book about Roswell had been published. The general public had published nothing about Project Mogul for consumption, but its advocates were aggressive and gearing-up to do battle. BBS's September 1993 AFFIDAVIT, to us, reflected the influence, if not a complete understanding, of her interview the previous month by one of the chief *Project Mogul* proponents, Karl Pflock [during our 1999 interview with BBS, she would respond, "Yeh, I heard about that." when something about *Project Mogul* was brought up]. We are not suggesting anything invidious here, only the natural influence of a then recent discussion. When a witness changes his or her story, the witness is said to have "flipped". Thus, BBS's 1993 AFFIDAVIT generally adhered to the *Mogul* line as it was known at the time and, more importantly, as it might have been understood by BBS. For instance, she not only mentioned the tape as before, but this time she now knew its color and width to conform to the descriptions and alleged dimensions of the tape used in *Project Mogul*. Perhaps in an effort to "explain" her father's prior description of seeing "figures and wiggles" on some of the debris which reminded him of writing on "Japanese firecrackers", BBS stated that the flowers on the tape reminded her of "Japanese paintings". BBS's comments regarding the "large balloon" that she now believed had crashed or exploded on the Foster Ranch, to us, reflect either a bizarre attempt to reconcile reports of the balloon and radar target debris at the crash site or, more likely, a misunderstanding of just what elements and materials constituted a *Mogul* "balloon train"; " ... it was a kind of double-sided material, foil-like on one side and *rubber-like* on the other." [emphasis added] Apparently, "trying to kill two birds with one stone", she has instead ventured into the



quicksand. No one, not even *Mogul* proponents, has suggested balloons made out of tinfoil or radar targets made out of rubber!

By 1999, much had been written in public forums about *Project Mogul* as the probable explanation of the Roswell events of 1947. Several books, the official Air Force studies and a *New York Times* front page story totally accepting of *Project Mogul* are just a few of these. BBS's 1999 statements to the authors, in our opinion, reflect an increased knowledge, if still not yet a workable understanding on her part of the elements of *Project Mogul*. It also reflected another attempt at correcting past misstatements. This time she separated the tinfoil from the rubber, but in doing so, the tinfoil now became a "Mylar"-type material with "memory" properties, and the rubber that had previously backed the tinfoil now became a different type of rubber, heavier than that used in common weather balloons. All of this was a lead-in to her declaration that, because the balloon material was so different from anything previously found in common weather balloons, what had crashed this time was something different – a high altitude balloon! It finally dawned on the authors that BBS was trying to describe a high altitude, *polyethylene* balloon of the type used in the later *Skyhook* program and later launches under *Project Mogul*! She was either confused or, more likely, unaware that *Project Mogul* Launch #4 of June 4<sup>th</sup> 1947, the linchpin of the entire "*Mogul* Theory of Roswell", while indeed a high altitude affair, employed common, neoprene [rubber] weather balloons and not *polyethylene* balloons. Her attempt to "spin" an earlier statement in the direction of the new explanation had inadvertently sunk the new explanation. She is either making it up as she goes along or cannot be describing the events of early July 1947. Either way, *Mogul* is the loser.

### **Summation and Verdict**

The reader should be able to see from the evidence presented in this paper that the case for *Project Mogul*, based upon an examination of several key issues relevant to the "Roswell Incident", fails. Expert witnesses that we have presented herein such as Robert Galganski have examined the case for *Project Mogul* empirically and have cogently concluded,

*Common sense, logic, a massive body of corroborative anecdotal evidence, and limited but fundamentally sound and persuasive empirical data and observations lead to an inescapable conclusion: Mogul Flight 4 was not responsible for the debris field.*

11

---

<sup>11</sup> Galganski, p.5

Unlike the case for Roswell as evidence of extraterrestrial visitation that has many corroborating witnesses, its alleged eyewitnesses disagree on almost everything, from the size of the debris field, to its location to what was found. There is no corroboration, thus no case can be made. This paper, we believe, points up the shortcomings in the testimony of its final witness left standing, Bessie Brazel Schreiber.

A case can be made, we believe, that BBS was not present on the Foster Ranch at the time of the Roswell events. In addition to the anecdotal statements made by her brother and by herself to our investigation that she wasn't in fact there when it happened, her statements to investigators have changed over time to such a degree as to "impeach" her as a credible witness on the case. Further, and we haven't touched on this previously, many of her statements to us are at odds with those of other witnesses. For instance, according to BBS, her and her family rode into Roswell with her father when he came to town to report his find. They then picnicked in a park as they waited for him to return. She says that no one followed them back to the Foster Ranch after her father met with the military at the Sheriff's Office [Marcel and Rickett both confirm that Marcel and Cavitt followed Mack Brazel back to the Foster Ranch on their initial trip to the debris field]. While Marcel, Cavitt and Brazel dined on a can of cold pork and beans that evening, they would not doubt be surprised and envious to learn that, according to BBS, her mother treated them instead to a fried chicken dinner with all the trimmings! According to BBS, her father never found anything so strange that he took it to his nearest neighbors, the Proctors, to show to them. It just didn't happen. BBS's account is also at odds with those who have stated that Mack Brazel was kept in custody for a week or so at the Roswell Army Air Field. These include family members like her brother Bill who went to help his father but found the ranch empty, neighbors such as the Floyd and Loretta Proctor, L.D. Sparks and others as well as military personnel such as Lt. Col. Joe Briley at the base who have confirmed this fact. BBS says this is nothing but "hogwash". If so, why did Mack complain so bitterly and liken his treatment by the Air Force to "being in jail" after returning to the ranch? Also by BBS's account, Mack was never sequestered by KGFL's Walt Whitmore, Sr. at his house overnight during which Mack Brazel made a wire recording about his find. Since this was another overnigher, it never happened. Already mentioned was BBS's claim that she, her father and little brother had gathered all of the wreckage up before the military arrived at the ranch. If true, Cavitt and Marcel never spent all day out at the Hines Draw gathering up the debris since there was none to gather up. And the convoys of military cleanup crews to and from the ranch which were reported to have taken place both by military participants and civilian witnesses also never happened. As stated at the outset, a witness' account of what happened that is so at variance with the accepted accounts of other witnesses must be rejected. We believe that BBS has met this threshold.



On the other hand, if we stipulate that BBS was in fact present on the Foster Ranch when the events to which she claims to have been a witness occurred and, further, that her account as described is essentially true and correct, *Project Mogul* Flight #4 fails as the Roswell explanation. This is because Flight #4, while certainly qualifying as a "high altitude" balloon affair, employed only neoprene balloons in its configuration, while BBS described to us what she saw as a polyethylene balloon.

Therefore, given the facts of the Roswell events of 1947 as we know them, in accordance with the preponderance and quality of the evidence as presented herein, only one verdict is reasonably possible. Bessie Brazel Schreiber is impeached as a credible witness to the Roswell events of 1947, and her entire testimony regarding her involvement in and her recollections of same must be rejected *in toto*. This conclusion also inures to the detriment of those advocating a *Project Mogul* "solution" to the 1947 incident, since there are now no known credible, first-hand, eyewitnesses, living or dead, to a balloon event in Mack Brazel's sheep pasture. This, along with other shortcomings, raises serious questions about the sustainability of the "*Mogul* Explanation" in a court of law, whether using the "preponderance of evidence" or even the "beyond a reasonable doubt" doctrines. Legally, under the rules of evidence, or scientifically, using "Occam's Law of Parsimony"<sup>12</sup>, *Project Mogul* fails as a viable explanation for the 1947 Roswell events and must be rejected. The disqualification of the remaining "witness" to an alleged Roswell balloon event now places the burden of proof squarely back in the camps of the United States Air Force and their balloonist defenders.

#### POST SCRIPTS:

Several times during the authors' 1999 interview with Bessie Brazel Schreiber, she stated that her father had warned the family not to believe what they might read about him in the newspapers over the next few days, that, "The Army is going to use me for some story." If true, it suggests that Mack Brazel might have had forewarning of his coming detention by the Army Air Force during which the "Harassed Rancher" was story given to the local press, or it could conceivably be used to support Brazel Schreiber's contention that her father was never held by the AAF against his will. When asked why this alleged statement of her father had never before been revealed before, Brazel Schreiber answered, "No one asked me." [NOTE: We didn't ask her either.]

---

<sup>12</sup> Carey, Thomas J., and Donald R. Schmitt, "Mack Brazel Reconsidered", *IUR*, Winter 1999, pp. 13-19

As our interview with Bessie Brazel Schreiber was concluding and we were getting up from the table to say our goodbyes, BBS suddenly stated in a loud voice for all, but no one in particular, to hear, "Our Dad was an old time cowboy. He was a man of few words, but if he said something happened, it ***happened!*** No 'ifs', 'ands' or 'buts'. Period!"

In the late Fall of 2001, Bessie Brazel Schreiber visited her brother Bill Brazel, Jr. at his ranch in Capitan, NM. They had not seen one another in years and had a lot of catching-up to do. At some point in their reminisces, the subject of the 1947 Roswell events came up. According to Bill Brazel, Jr., Bessie questioned Bill, Jr. several times about it, mainly wanting to know if, in fact, she was actually there [at her father's ranch] or not. Bill, Jr. has maintained for many years that she was not.



## SUBMISSION GUIDELINES FOR POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTORS.

The European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies is the journal of TRUTH [The Totton Researchers of Ufology Theory and History]. The journal has been initially set up to bring the European UFO community closer and is primarily, but not exclusively aimed at these organisations. The journal is objective in nature, allowing an outlet for the broad spectrum of issues related to UFO and Abduction phenomena. This includes all academic based subjects (e.g. astronomy, biology, psychology etc.) as well as spiritual aspects, scepticism and new theoretical issues. Therefore, the European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies wants to publish ufological papers and ideas from a wide range of individuals, organisations and stand points.

### Types of papers and articles we are looking for

In reality, there are no papers that we will not consider. However, to help potential contributors, below are broad areas you may wish to write about:

**Theoretical issues.** These articles may assess the validity of existing theories, expand on existing theories or present new theoretical ideas.

**Historical issues.** These articles may look at the historical progression of UFO and Abduction phenomena or describe ancient accounts and issues.

**Empirical studies.** These articles may be a report on primary research and data collection/analysis. Analysis of attitudes towards the UFO and Abduction phenomena may be an avenue of thought for instance.

**Methodological and Investigation issues.** These articles may assess the methods and investigative techniques that ufology employs. They may also suggest particular methods that could be useful in the field of ufology.

**Cultural issues.** These articles may look at whether particular aspects of ufology are culturally unique or non-culture bound.

**Commentaries.** These articles can assess the notions published by authors in the European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies.

**Case Studies / Reports of enhanced sightings (e.g. 'flaps').** These articles can give details of interesting cases or 'flaps' which may not have got a wider audience before. These will still be reviewed to ensure that the reports are ethically sound (see the notes on ethics within these submission guidelines).

Authors of papers accepted in the above categories will receive a free copy of the journal that their paper appears in (if a paper has more than one author, the lead author will get the free copy). For articles accepted in the categories below, no free copy will be sent.

**Research Noticeboard.** This section will allow researchers to communicate with one another in order to collaborate and discuss work. This will be an essential section for ufology researchers. Calls for help with research will be included.

**Reviews.** Publishers and broadcasting companies may send books and videos for review. This section will give an objective view of the items sent.

## Ethical Considerations

For articles that describe research using human participants, ethical guidelines must have been adhered to or the article will be returned without review. Research, therefore, should adhere to the ethical guidelines of the British Psychological Society or the American Psychological Association (or other recognised National Guidelines in your home nation - please supply us with details). Work with individuals who you feel are 'abductees' must also meet the guidelines described in "Ethics Code for Abduction Experience Investigation and Treatment," Journal of UFO Studies, Vol 5 (1994).

Research that is seen as being ethically dubious will not be reviewed or published in this journal. If names are to be mentioned, consent for this in written form must be sent to the Editor along with the article submitted which involves the individuals in question. Pseudonyms can be used as long as it is clear that the name provided is one.

### Submission of papers

Papers should be sent to the following address: Craig Roberts, Editor of EJUFOS, UFO Studies, Totton College, Water Lane, Totton, Southampton, SO40 3ZX, England. Alternatively, authors can submit articles via electronic mail to: ejufos@totton.ac.uk

**Papers sent via postal mail.** Submissions should arrive in triplicate on A4 sized paper. A front sheet should be provided with the title of the paper along with the author(s) address(es) [postal and e-mail if applicable]. Then, the paper will be peer reviewed (blind) by three members of the editorial board.

**Papers sent via electronic mail.** Two electronic mails have to be sent. One must have the title of the paper along with the author(s) address(es) [postal and e-mail if applicable]. The second must contain the paper along with any images and figures as attachments that are either in text form or Microsoft Word compatible. Then, the paper will be peer reviewed (blind) by three members of the editorial board.

All papers must include a full reference section where authors of papers and books, the title of the book/article, the volume (if applicable) and year of publication are clearly visible. The following style is preferred:

### For citing articles.

Hickman, J.C., McConkey III, E.D. and Barrett, M.A. (1995/6) 'Fewer Sightings in the National Press: A Content Analysis of UFO News Coverage in the New York Times, 1947-1995,' Journal of UFO Studies, Vol 6 (new series), p.213-226.

### For citing books.

Nagatis, C. and Mantle, P. (1994) *Without Consent: A Comprehensive Survey of Missing-Time and Abduction Phenomena in the UK*. Ringpull Press Limited, Cheshire, UK.

### For citing chapters from books.

Wagstaff, G.F. (1986) 'Hypnosis as Compliance and Belief: A Socio-Cognitive View,' in P.L.N. Naish (ed.) *What is Hypnosis? Current Theories and Research* Open University Press, Milton Keynes, UK, p.59-84.